DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 918 HE 003 019

AUTHOR	Hobbs, Nicholas, Ed.
TITLE	The Prospects for Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Southern Newspaper Publishers Asscciation, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE	[71]
NOTE	95p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Newspaper Publishers Asscciation Foundation, P.O. Box 11606, Atlanta, Georgia 30305 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; *Educational Accountability; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; *Educational Innovation; *Educational Planning; Governance; *Higher Education; Journalism; Negro Education

ABSTRACT

The Southern Newspaper Publishers Association (SNPA) Foundation, in cooperation with various Southern universities, each year conducts a program of seminars for Southern journalists. The purpose of the seminars is to give those whose responsibility it is to report, edit, and comment on the news the opportunity to increase their knowledge and understanding of the complex events with which they deal in their work. The 1971 seminar, held at Vanderbilt University, dealt with the future prospects for higher education. This document is comprised of papers presented at that seminar. The papers are: (1) "University and Society: Educational Freedom and Institutional Obligation"; (2) "Financing Higher Education in the 'Crisis' Period"; (3) "A Challenge to Higher Education"; (4) "Educational Reform and Social Change: A Student Perspective"; (5) "The Higher Education of Black Americans for the Decade of the 1970s"; (6) "The Governance of Universities"; and (7) "The Community College: Myth and Reality". (HS)

Erratum

Please insert before page 1 in *The Prospects for Higher Education,* Atlanta, Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation (1972).

The following paper by Alexander Heard is a slight modification of one previously published in *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society,* Vol. 115, no. 6, pp. 423-5, December 1971, and is printed here with permission of the Society.

ED 062 918

The Prospects For Higher Education

Nicholas Hobbs, *Editor*
Provost, Vanderbilt University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SNPA Foundation Seminar Books

Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation, Atlanta, Georgia

2

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 72-75095

Contents

Foreword

Preface

University and Society: Educational Freedom and Institutional Obligation 1
Alexander Heard

Financing Higher Education in the "Crisis" Period 7
John Folger

A Challenge to Higher Education 19
Frank Newman

Educational Reform and Social Change: A Student Perspective 30
John Gaventa

The Higher Education of Black Americans for the Decade of the 1970s 45
Stephen J. Wright

The Governance of Universities 54
Nicholas Hobbs

The Community College: Myth and Reality 67
Richard C. Richardson, Jr.

Biographical Information 82

Foreword

The Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation, in cooperation with Southern universities, conducts a program of seminars for Southern journalists. The purpose of the seminars is to give those whose responsibility it is to report, edit and comment on the news the opportunity to increase their knowledge and understanding of the complex events with which they deal in their work. Toward this end, journalists are brought together with educators and practitioners in areas of their common concern.

The primary objective of the seminars is discussion and the exchange of information among those in attendance. When the proceedings at a seminar produce appropriate materials, they are published in book form. In this way the SNPA Foundation makes available to a wider audience the knowledge and insights developed at seminars.

This volume is the eighth in the series of SNPA Foundation Seminar Books. It is the product of a seminar held at Vanderbilt University, July 18-22, 1971. Nicholas Hobbs, provost at Vanderbilt, was program chairman and presiding officer for the seminar. He also is editor of this book.

The SNPA Foundation will add to this series of books as a contribution to increased knowledge and better understanding of the great social, economic, political, scientific, cultural, and environmental issues of our time.

Reed Sarratt
Executive Director
SNPA Foundation

Preface

In the summer of 1971 the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation sponsored at Vanderbilt University a seminar on "The Prospects for Higher Education." Members of the seminar were newspapermen from across the South—reporters, editorial writers, a publisher. The faculty were men whose experience permitted them to address the ambitious topic from a variety of informed positions: the former president of a black liberal arts college, a leader in the community college movement, an influential critic of undergraduate education, a student leader, a university chancellor.

The papers presented to the seminar address three issues of importance to higher education. The issues underlie the recent and current travail of the college and the university, and the form of their resolution will shape higher education in America for decades ahead. The first issue embraces the relationship of the college or university to contemporary society, and the conflicts of freedom and obligation generated therefrom. Included are such mundane matters as how colleges and universities are to be financed and governed. A second theme is the impact on higher education of a radical tradition, at once asserted and denied in American life, yet identified historically with it and thus essentially conservative: the doctrine of equal access to opportunity for all people, men and women, black and white, young and old, rich and poor. The third issue involves the influence on colleges and universities of two interrelated, swift-running currents in American society, described inadequately by such phrases as

"participatory democracy", on the one hand, and "black identity", "Chicano identity", and "personal awareness" on the other.

These several themes thread their way through seven papers.

Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, examines the unique role of the university in the service of the nation at a particular time in its history. The university is the prime generator of knowledge, the fuel that powers social machinery and thus determines in large measure the nation's internal wealth and external advantage. Responsibility for the generation of knowledge places constraints on the university that are not fully understood by the public and alumni or even by trustees, faculty, and students.

Frank Newman's name appeared a few years ago like a comet on higher education horizons. Noting the high attrition rates in colleges and universities, he asserts: "But still, when all is said and done, most students leave college because they find it an unattractive and unrewarding experience. We can't avoid this conclusion and we can't avoid asking ourselves why it is so." Newman's essay presents provocative answers to this crucial question, and raises other questions as well.

John Gaventa was president of the Student Association at Vanderbilt the year before the seminar and went on afterward to Balliol College, Oxford, as a Rhodes Scholar. Essentially, Gaventa addresses the same question asked by Newman, except he does it from the point of view of an intelligent, responsible student who was privileged to attend a private university of standing. Gaventa makes clear why this privilege is less than it should and can be.

Stephen J. Wright, formerly president of Fisk University and now vice-president of the College Entrance Examination Board, discusses the problem of higher education for black Americans. After a perceptive, data-backed analysis, he concludes: "The big task during the 1970s will be that of convincing white America that equal higher education for black Americans is an investment rather than a charity, a means of breaking the self-perpetuating poverty cycle, an insurance against the 'social dynamite' that characterized the black ghettos

in the 1970s." Many informed analysts agree that the outcome of the American experiment will depend more heavily on the resolution of black-white relationships than on any other factor. Because of the consequence of higher education to individual destinies, as well as to the strength of the nation, colleges and universities perforce will play a major role in determining the answer.

Richard C. Richardson Jr., president of North Hampton County Area Community College, describes one of the most exciting and influential developments in higher education in America in recent decades, the emergence of the community college as a unique institution filling a major social need. Dr. Richardson's analysis not only informs us of a little-appreciated movement but also implies the kind of regeneration essential to the full effectiveness of the four-year college and the university.

John Folger, director of the Commission on Higher Education for the State of Tennessee, presents a keen analysis of the financial plight of colleges and universities and makes astute predictions of what federal, state, and private resources in support of higher education will be like in the immediate future.

My paper attempts to advance the many discussions of the governance of universities by focusing on the political component in the management of a peculiarly complex human enterprise.

These papers altogether assume the enormous importance of higher education in the affairs of men and nations today. While a college education has always been prized in America, with opportunities open for many to achieve it, the nation is now well into an era of universal higher education. Some kind of post-secondary educational experience has become a standard expectation both by individuals planning their own careers and by legislative bodies planning educational resources. Further, the higher educational experience is likely to be continued by more and more people throughout their careers and into retirement. Finally, artificial barriers to higher education are being torn down across the nation. Open admissions policies, special recruiting campaigns, and substantial public and private scholarship programs are providing access to opportunity on a scale that could hardly have been imagined even a decade

ago. We appear to be making truly remarkable progress in this laudable direction.

Why, then, is higher education in so much trouble? Why is the public suspicious of universities? Why are legislators cool to their economic needs? Why the financial crisis in higher education? Why do students and others who would radically change society attack the university, the world over? The set of issues defined by these questions is illuminated by observations made in every one of the papers in this volume.

The relationship of a society to its universities (that part of the higher education system charged with the generation of knowledge as well as with its dissemination) has altered in radical ways within the past three decades. The advanced nations of the world are now knowledge-based societies. The significance of knowledge as a primary source of power is something quite new in the world, a product of the cumulative character of science, and of its exponential growth in recent decades. Pre-industrial era empires were built on control of land and of populations. Industrial era empires, both individual and state, were built on control of the machine, of the means of producing material goods. Empires today, both corporate and state, require land, people, and machines, to be sure, but their pre-eminent requirement is for knowledge, or more precisely, for new knowledge. The power of a nation today rests heavily on the effectiveness of its major knowledge-generating apparatus. In the United States this is the university. This fact is well understood by radicals, who attack the university to bring down the society. It is less well understood by conservatives who attack the university for generating knowledge that brings power but changes values. Increased public understanding of this changed university-society relationship is much needed to restore confidence in the university and to assure society of the new knowledge it needs to grow in wisdom and in strength.

Here, then, are the papers. Unhappily there is no record of the lively discussion provoked by their presentation.

Nicholas Hobbs
Seminar Chairman
Vanderbilt University

University and Society: Educational Freedom and Institutional Obligation

Alexander Heard

Recently, a sophomore student, with hot, piercing eyes and his neck cords drawn tense with emotion, cried aloud to me, "You can't worry about freedom of speech and things like that, when something like Cambodia is going on!" There are higher values, he was saying, for students and faculties and universities, than freedom of expression.

Somewhat earlier, a faculty member, flushed with righteousness, assaulted in my presence a university's concept of institutional neutrality toward important, partisan, political issues. To remain neutral is equivalent to watching idly while a grizzly bear and a man fight it out, he said.

These persons came from two of our eminent universities, where traditions of far-ranking inquiry and controversial advocacy have been richly nurtured by long heritages of intellectual freedom militantly defended.

And, to enlarge the paradoxical season, came the prosaic college president asserting the obligation of his academic brothers to respect in their words and actions the tolerance limits of surrounding community opinion, so that their educational mission could win the community understanding necessary for it to march forward.

We in higher education are accustomed to defending the intellectual independence, the educational freedom, of our campuses against attacks from without. Our defending skills will not grow rusty for lack of exercise

in the future. But we now must address, in addition, new forms of complex and intricate doubt from within.

I

Clearly, the proper definition of educational freedom has become increasingly controversial inside American universities. Where the definition remains unclear or seriously in dispute, our universities will find it difficult to assure a climate hospitable to independent thought and expression, a climate essential if universities are to perform in the future the functions we in America have expected of them during the past century.

Disagreements and obscurities of definition do not emerge simply out of abstract concepts of social action or educational philosophy. Nor are they simply products of conflicting human motivation, people thought to be good versus people thought to be bad. The deeper difficulties that concern us originate in the ever-present interdependence of university and society—and consequently, in our times, in the character and intensity of society's stresses, and in the numerous and complicated functions undertaken in that society by universities. Both the stresses of society and the roles of universities are changing. In defining educational freedom, what is the steady target?

In his book, *Universities*, published in 1930, Alexander Flexner examined the universities of England, Germany, and the United States. He concluded, like others before and since, that: "Every age, every country, has its unique concrete needs and purposes. For that reason there can be no uniform university type, persisting through the ages, transferable from one country to another. Every age does its own creating and re-shaping; so does every country." This quality of universities as variable *institutions*, as functional institutions responsive to their environment, if you will, increases the necessity, and the difficulty, of discerning the inherently necessary quality of a university—the *idea* of a university, as it has been most famously phrased—to which true universities aspire in common, regardless of their form, or time, or place.

As I read the history of universities, the thread that

runs through the life of the university as a distinctive social institution, in all its forms in all the centuries, is the thread of inquiry and ultimately inquiry about anything. Other institutions may bring the student to beauty, or thought, or skill, or values, or information, or maturity. Universities may do these things, too, but it is the addition of exploration to exposition that defines historically the unique role and unique responsibility of a university. If an institution is to be a university, it must provide the conditions of educational freedom under which exploration can take place. Central to exploration is the human mind and its use of reason.

At this point a student of intellectual history, or a philosopher, will remind us forcefully that there is in reality no total freedom for the human mind. Any grand mode of thought, in an Age of Scholasticism or in an Age of Science, embraces assumptions or presuppositions, of which many are not aware and from which others will not or cannot free themselves. A university, nevertheless, to fulfill itself as a university, will seek to make it possible to examine the assumptions, the conventions, the taboos of the time, and the structure of knowledge and belief that rests upon them.

II

And that brings us back to the student, the faculty member, the president who challenge the assumptions, the conventions, the taboos of the university. They force us to examine the fundamental university concepts of free expression, of political impartiality, and of institutional independence, as we have defined and tried to apply them in the United States.

Among the paradoxical dichotomies that run through university life—and that form the matrix of dilemmas in which every university functions—are four of special significance to this task, and to the interaction between society and university that gives rise to this task.

The *first* is the inherent conflict between the function of transmitting existing information or values or skills, on the one hand, and the processes of evaluation, criticism, and creativity that question whatever is existing, on the other. Education generally has served much

remarked stabilizing functions of socialization and acculturation for our society. Taxpayers, parents, satisfied citizens, and hosts of others with a belief in the ongoing way expect it to do so. At the same time, especially in our time, the enormously expanded investigative, research dimension of universities is busily spawning and spreading new information, insights, and speculation that build to new technological systems, new social conditions, and new philosophical critiques, all of which add up to a formidable challenge to the existing qualities of society being transmitted.

A *second* pair of contradictory qualities lies in the need for a university to be at once utilitarian and independent. It must in its most fundamental achievements serve the society that supports it; otherwise it will not be supported. The greatest social utility of the university is as critic and inventor—to achieve which, it must maintain fundamental intellectual independence from its sources of support. The practical benefits of crop research are evident to the most demanding utilitarian citizen. The value of social ethics is probably less evident to him, yet in fact social ethics may require not only support, but support for which the university is not held accountable in any but the largest sense.

Tension between campus and street flows from both of these conflicts. From the outside the university may appear to be changing more than preserving the way of life. And it appears to appeal for the protection and nurture of society while resisting anybody's effort to direct its work.

A *third* dichotomy separates the university as institution from the actions of the people—hopefully intellectually free people—who make it up. Once I knew a president who worried about the editorial page of the student newspaper. The masthead said it was the official student newspaper. If it is an official newspaper, said the president, it is a spokesman for the campus. How can we permit it to publish any viewpoint it wishes? He did not see that it was the newspaper, not the viewpoint, that was official, just as it is the lecture series, not what the visiting senator or Black Panther says, that is part of the official program of the university.

In the contemporary American model, a faculty mem-

ber may choose his own objects of research, may choose whether and what professional services he wishes to render outside the university, and often what and how he will teach. He has the privilege of doing these things, however, only because he is *of* the university. And the university has no life without him. So observers without and within assign responsibility to the university for what he does—urban analysis or military research, for example—as indeed I did a moment ago in referring to the university itself as critic and inventor.

Fourth and finally, the educational freedom necessary for this strange institution, the modern American university, to be effective must be sustained by consensus in the society outside. And this when the university is the sponsor of curiosity, skepticism, criticism, creativity, change—all of which can challenge and erode established social consensus. The consensus needed on and off campus to support campus intellectual freedom requires basically the same kinds of social values, political principles, and degree of cultural homogeneity that a free, democratic political system requires. That means, in turn, that when such a larger political system is endangered, the free university is likewise imperiled. That is one reason extreme stress in the American social system threatens the university. If our institutions of government prove incapable of handling the nation's problems in accordance with democratic procedural values, the campus will feel directly the impact of whatever authoritarian, anarchistic, or other alternatives in government emerge.

Extreme social stress poses dangers for the university for another reason also. The revolutionary who seeks to derail the existing order assaults the university, not alone because its vulnerability makes it an inviting target for disruption, but also because it is the central secular institution in our society outside of government itself. To maim the university is ultimately to damage the society.

III

In these complex circumstances, a university's obligation (to itself) to maintain conditions of educational

freedom essential for its own work includes, but also extends beyond, the traditional basic insistence on an open forum for all and unfettered inquiry within its own precincts. Their price, as always, is eternal vigilence against attack from any quarter, near or far.

The social values of open forum and free inquiry cannot be realized without the political neutrality of the university as an institution, except where the university itself is the issue. And it is important to add that a university's obligation to intellectual freedom must embrace a subtle and pervasive commitment to the canons of reason in all it does, an obligation that extends to all members of the community of scholarship, in the classroom and out, an obligation that is not invariably fulfilled.

With freedom in the university dependent ultimately on freedom in the society, and with freedom in the society dependent ultimately on the effectiveness of social, political, and economic institutions, a university's self-interest in intellectual freedom impels it to do all it can through its own processes to help make the society succeed, to help make it open, just, safe, prosperous, peaceful.

Higher education in America is now entering a significant period of transition and reshaping, probably as profound as that it went through in the nineteenth century. The purposes and ways of work of universities will be basic parts of the agenda. The enhancement of intellectual freedom will require universities to fulfill their paradoxical role of serving the national needs on which that freedom ultimately depends, without losing their independence or the distinction between themselves as institutions and their members. Universities must fortify the consensus of values that undergird intellectual freedom, without becoming enslaved to a static order. Universities must help maintain the continuity and stability of the larger community, without foregoing the obligations of critic and creator.

Financing Higher Education In The "Crisis" Period

John Folger

The financial crisis has replaced student unrest as the top educational topic. From all sides, the colleges and universities are rushing to plead poverty and dismal prospects for the future. Financial brinksmanship is the order of the day. For several years it has been recognized that colleges had serious money problems, but now the very symbols of affluence in higher education such as Yale, Stanford, and Berkeley are being portrayed as in "serious financial difficulty."

It seems paradoxical that colleges and universities are in a financial crisis at the very time that enrollment growth is slowing down, new management techniques are coming into wider use, and faculty members are becoming more plentiful and easier to hire. The job of financing our colleges should be getting easier.

It is very tempting in this situation to use the historical approach, and consider what our viewpoint would have been in 1961. I would not have predicted that Tennessee, which that year appropriated about $20 million for the operation of public higher education, would appropriate 10 years hence over $100 million for higher education. It would have seemed an unattainable goal and most experts, laymen, and probably all legislators would have discounted the possibility. If I had gone on to predict that this remarkable effort on the part of Tennessee would leave it behind most of the neighboring states, and near the bottom in the region in per-student appropriations, most people would have probably concluded that I was way off base.

In 1971, I can project that the next 10 years will require only a three-fold increase in Tennessee's appropriations, rather than the five-fold increase that occurred in the last decade. However, our nation's self-doubts and uncertainties are so great that the possibility of achieving this more modest goal will probably be discounted. It is true that an increase from $100 million to $300 million represents a $200 million growth, while an increase from $20 million to $100 million is only $80 million. But in terms of effort, meeting the larger needs of higher education in the 1970s is going to be easier to accomplish in Tennessee and in nearly every other state.

Today we don't have much confidence that historical trends will continue. Because our economy and society are in a period of profound change, historical trends may be a very poor guide to the future.

The problems of financing higher education are complex and diverse; they arise basically from the different sources of income available to different groups of institutions. As Howard Bowen has said: "The basic principle of college finance is very simple. Institutions raise as much money as they can get, and spend it all. Cost per student is therefore determined primarily by the amount of money that can be raised."

If we want to look at the future prospects of an institution, we need to examine its income sources, and their possibilities for future expansion. This approach has a weakness, however, because it overlooks the possibilities for a more efficient expenditure of funds, and we need to consider that possibility, too.

The remainder of this paper examines the revenue prospects, and the prospects for a more efficient operation, of three groups of institutions: (1) private liberal arts colleges, (2) research and graduate universities, and (3) other public colleges and universities. Before we look at these specific groups of institutions, certain general trends and prospects will be examined.

I

The Carnegie Commission has made detailed projections of enrollment in higher education, by level and

type of institution. They indicate that college enrollment will grow in numbers as much during the 1970s as it did in the 1960s, although the *rate* of growth will be only about half the growth rate of the 1960s. In brief, about 4,500,000 to 5,000,000 more students will be enrolled in the fall of 1980 than in the fall of 1970, when about 8,000,000 students were enrolled. About 2,000,000 of the additional students will be enrolled in community colleges, which will double their enrollment from 2,000,000 to 4,000,000 during the decade. Another 1,800,000 to 2,000,000 students will be added in the state colleges and urban universities, exclusive of the major research universities. The remaining 700,000 to 1,200,000 new students will be added in the major research universities and in the private liberal arts colleges. Neither of these latter groups of institutions will grow more than 15 to 25 percent in enrollment. The projections may have underestimated the growth of the big public "multiversities." There is widespread agreement among educators and politicians that our biggest universities are already too large, but these institutions have a big stake in continued growth as a way of expanding their budgets. Because they have a lot of political influence left, they may grow more than these projections indicate.

So much for enrollment growth. Total institutional expenditures for education operations increased from about $4.5 billion nationally in 1960 to about $15.2 billion in 1970, and are projected by the Office of Education to expand to about $24-26 billion by 1980 (in constant 1968 dollars). These figures are limited to expenditures for current educational activities. They exclude capital outlay, expenditures for auxillary enterprises, and funds for student aid. If all of these other expenditures are included too, 1970 expenditures are about $21.5 billion. Expressed as a percentage of the gross national product, expenditures have expanded from less than 1 percent in 1960, to 1.5 percent in 1970, and are projected to increase to 2 to 2.5 percent by 1980. This is not a large share of our total national wealth, and if we want to provide it, we have the ability.

State tax revenues are the largest single source of support for higher educational operations. In 1960 the

states appropriated a little less than $1.5 billion for higher education, and by 1970 they had increased this to more than $7 billion. About 35 percent of all the support for current higher education operations comes from the states, about 30 percent from the federal government, about 25 percent from the students, and the remaining 10 percent from gifts, endowments, and other sources. The patterns of income are quite different for public and private institutions, and for large universities and the smaller colleges.

Another basic trend is the rise in educational costs on a per-student, as well as overall, basis. William Bowen, the Princeton economist, has documented the rise of per-student costs at an average of about 7 to 8 percent a year over a long period of time. We might ask why this is so. Since colleges have grown so much, we might expect economies of scale to halt, or at least slow down, the trends in rising costs. Up to now, any possible economics of scale (and there are some) have been overwhelmed by the effects of inflation and the rise in the real income of professors and other college employees. Bowen points out that as productivity increases in the economy as a whole, the real income of workers increases; as workers' income rises, college workers' salaries have to be increased to keep them competitive. Like hospitals, symphony orchestras, and other service activities that use a lot of labor, colleges find their costs spiraling upward as they attempt to keep their salaries competitive with other parts of the economy. This is a very important part of the financial dilemma in higher education, but it is a point that is not very well understood.

The only antidote for increased personnel costs is increased productivity per worker, and colleges and universities—like hospitals, good restaurants, and similar service undertakings—have relatively poor records in this area. If productivity does not increase, the alternatives are higher costs to the users, or greater government subsidies. Higher education has used both methods. Tuition charges in both public and private institutions have increased about three times as rapidly as the cost of living during the 1960s. Government subsidies have increased even more rapidly.

These long-term trends in rising costs may proceed about as rapidly in the 1970s as they did in the sixties. They may slow down a little, or they may slow down a lot if the public is unwilling to support increased government payments, and the students are unwilling to pay higher tuition. Inflation seems likely to be a continuing factor, although the rise in academic wages relative to other workers may be much lower in the seventies and may even decline because the supply of qualified candidates is so much larger, and because money is harder to get.

Higher education faces continued rapid rises in requirements for funds, because the number of students going to college is still increasing, and because costs per student are also being pushed up by inflation and increased personnel costs.

Let us examine the prospects of the three major groups of institutions for meeting those requirements.

II

The principal cause of the financial crisis among the major research universities, both public and private, is the leveling off of federal support for research and graduate education, and the shifting of federal support patterns to student aid and programs for disadvantaged students.

The federal government is the largest single source of funds for the private research universities, which get 40 percent of their educational and general funds from this source. When these funds stop growing, as they have since 1968, and costs continue to rise at 7 to 10 percent a year, the budget will get out of balance very quickly.

The large private universities get about 30 percent of their income from tuition. In 1960 tuition averaged $960 a year in private universities; by 1970 it had increased to almost $1,800. Further increases in tuition will be increasingly difficult for the private universities. Their undergraduate tuition already subsidizes part of the graduate costs, and it seems unlikely that it will be able to take up the slack which has been caused by federal funds leveling off. The private universities

are overcommitted to graduate programs, which the federal government has suddenly decided are in excess of the national needs.

The public universities are faced with a similar set of problems. Federal funds comprise 25 to 30 percent of their revenue, with state appropriations making up about 45 percent of the budget, and tuition supplying only 13 percent. The leveling off of federal research funds has hit the public universities, too, and their graduate programs and research are affected in the same way that the private universities have been affected.

At the heart of the financial problem of both public and private research universities is the failure of the federal government to have a clear commitment to the continuing support of the research and graduate programs it has helped to launch. It is important to understand that this is not a decline in federal support to the universities, only a leveling off from an annual growth rate of about 15 percent in federal support during the early 1960s. But without the stimulus of federal monies since sputnik, our university-based graduate programs and research would only be a fourth to a third of their present size, and the leveling off of federal funds would not have created the same kind of crisis.

The most prestigious universities have gotten further into bed with the federal sugar daddy, and so were affected most when he turned his attentions elsewhere. Schools like M.I.T., Cal Tech, Chicago, and Stanford received between half and three-fourths of all their educational and general income from the federal government, and they have been hit hardest.

III

We turn now to that group of four-year colleges and smaller public universities that is growing most rapidly, and will absorb over half of the enrollment increases that are projected for four-year colleges. These institutions have had a limited involvement with the federal government, and obtain only 15 percent of their income from federal sources. Their big source of revenue is state appropriations, which provide 60 percent of their

income, while the public research universities get only 45 percent from the state.

Unfortunately, there are signs that state aid to higher education is not growing fast enough. While only six of the 50 states followed the federal pattern and actually leveled off or decreased their appropriations to higher education in 1971, half of the states had increases that provided less than a 5 percent increase in per-student appropriations. Because of the 5 percent inflation in the same year, half of the states actually lost ground in their aid to colleges and universities.

The financial "crisis" for the public institutions is a spotty one. It is bad in some states including California, Wisconsin, Kansas, and Alabama, but non-existent in states that are still registering increases. States which appear particularly vulnerable in the future are those 15 or so (including Tennessee, Florida and Texas) that do not have state income taxes. These states are almost sure to have financial problems because an inelastic tax structure doesn't expand as fast as economic growth, and existing tax sources are about at capacity. Other states that are likely to experience a crisis are those that are growing rapidly in population, such as California and Florida, or those (Illinois and Pennsylvania, for instance) in which the public sector is assuming more responsibility for support of the formerly private institutions.

An underlying problem in the states is the crisis in confidence in public institutions. Higher education, which has enjoyed great popularity in the past, is sharing heavily in the general public disenchantment with major social institutions. Some of the loss of confidence may be attributed to incidents of campus protest or violence, but far more is part of a general dissatisfaction with the way things are going in America.

The decline of the image of colleges and universities will affect their ability to compete for the tax dollar. Although the relative position of higher education among the various state functions may not change much, legislators and the public are showing greater reluctance to raise taxes required for a rapidly growing public service such as higher education. There is more inclination to call on the colleges to be more efficient,

more accountable, and to ask the students to pay more of the bill.

Since students in public institutions pay only about 14 percent of the academic costs, there is some possibility of tuition increases to generate more revenue. However, about 40 to 50 percent of young people come from families that cannot afford to pay the present costs of a public higher education without some help. Any rise in tuition that is not off-set by greater scholarship and self-help opportunities will price these students out of higher education.

IV

We have saved the worst problem for last. The private liberal arts colleges have been in a financial bind for several years. Their problem arises from the fact that they get an average of 55 percent of their income from tuition, only 7 percent from the federal or state government and the remaining 35 to 40 percent from gifts, endowment income, and other sources. Their tuition charges doubled during the decade, from about $720 to about $1,440 on the average, and a number of private colleges have tuition charges in the $2000-to-$3000 range. The average tuition charges in private colleges are about 4½ times the charges in public universities and colleges, and this is the essence of the problem. The private colleges are pricing themselves out of the market. Since they are mostly residential, the student considering a private college needs a minimum of $2,500 to $3,000 a year, and only about 10 percent of the families in the United States can afford to send their children to an average-priced private college without either savings or some form of scholarship or work assistance.

The noncompetitive nature of the private colleges is indicated by the fact that their enrollments have stopped growing and, for nearly half of the private colleges, have actually declined in the last five years. Private liberal arts colleges enrolled only about 15 percent of all college students in 1971, and they will probably enroll only about 10 percent in 1980.

A declining enrollment is a special problem for many

of the smaller colleges, which have no effective way to cut back on costs. About half of the private colleges are too small to offer an effective program at a reasonable cost, and so their costs per student are higher. Private colleges spend an average of about 20 percent more per student than public colleges, and part of this differential is caused by a size so small that operation is necessarily inefficient.

A large number of private colleges will have to close during the next decade unless they get some form of public subsidy, either directly from the government, or indirectly from scholarship programs that are open to middle-income youth. There has been a big build-up of federal scholarship funds during the last five years, but these funds are directed almost entirely toward low-income students. Relatively little help has gone to middle-income youth, who used to be able to afford a private college, but now attend a public one instead.

About 25 states have scholarship programs that are available to students attending both public and private colleges. In addition, the federal government is now considering direct support grants to colleges based on need, but the exact form of the awards is not yet settled. Whether these measures will be sufficient and in time to enable the majority of private colleges to survive remains to be seen.

V

Management experts have been operating in the higher education market for many years, but the financial difficulties of more schools have led to a boom in their services. In addition, legislators and state budget offices have begun to ask more questions, and to poke their noses into college and university business. Educational institutions have been portrayed as relatively inefficient operations, and, in addition, shortsighted for not anticipating their current money difficulties. The current troubles of Lockheed, Penn Central, or the nearest hospital can always be sighted to show that higher education doesn't have a monopoly on financial difficulties. But it doesn't help balance a budget to recog-

nize that other bright people have gone broke, too. What we need to know is whether College X, which ran a deficit last year, can run as good an educational program at less money next year.

The focus of attention on cost reduction and avoiding unbalanced budgets diverts attention from the central question, which is: What educational effects do various cost-saving procedures have? One of the chapters in the Newman Report is entitled "The Illegitimacy of Cost Effectiveness" and it contains some cogent warnings about the dangers of putting cost considerations ahead of (or separate from) educational considerations.

If colleges and universities can't raise enough money to continue to operate in the way they have in the past, they're going to have to institute new and less expensive procedures. But the important question is what educational effects they will have. If colleges are going to save money and maintain and improve their educational effectiveness, they may have to change their goals, as well as their management techniques. For example, a university may need new goals that put less emphasis on research and more on teaching. New management systems can identify where the money is going now, but they may not be very helpful in redirecting goals, or in assessing the long run educational consequences of some new management technique.

There is plenty of evidence that many colleges and universities can be operated at less cost, and some new procedures, such as reducing the length of some professional programs, may be both better educationally and less expensive. I believe that this period of austerity will have a number of beneficial effects if it leads colleges to re-think the economics of their operations in relation to the educational effectiveness of their goals and procedures.

It is tempting to try to put some price tag on the "savings" that can be achieved by increasing the size of small colleges, reducing curriculum proliferation, cutting the length of some programs, etc. But the problems are too complex and the assumptions required are too numerous to give much confidence in the kind of estimates that can be made. In my judgment the potential savings are quite substantial, and one of the top challenges of the

next decade is how to do a better educational job without raising the costs.

An astrologer might have some explanation of the combination of circumstances that led to a simultaneous shortage in the three major sources of support—federal funds, state appropriations, and student tuition. These three sources account for about 9 out of 10 dollars that flow into the educational operation of colleges and universities, and when all of them slow their expansion at the same time, there is trouble.

The federal government has leveled support after a period of unusually rapid increase. The 15 percent annual increase in support of the early 1960s will not come back, but there should be some commitment to support in an orderly way those educational programs (medical, graduate, and professional) that the government has helped develop in the past decade. The government did this in agriculture, and it seemed to be doing this in graduate education and research, only to back off in a way which hurt the best universities the most. Some defend the federal shift in priorities as a good thing that keeps higher education on its toes, but it is also having the effect of bringing some of the best universities to their knees. The nature of the political process in Washington has worked against clear federal educational goals and commitments, and universities are now paying a price for it.

Most state governments are still increasing support to their public colleges, but in only half of the states did the 1971 increase match the growth of enrollment plus the effects of inflation. Inelastic tax structures, which add to state revenues less than the growth of income in the state, and high rates of enrollment growth in some other states, make the financial prospects in some states poor. Others can be expected to finance the growth of their institutions adequately as long as the people still have confidence in higher education.

Tuition will probably become an increasingly important source of income because state and federal sources are not taking care of the rising costs of higher education. The biggest tuition increases seem likely in public institutions, although the private colleges need

the money more. The private colleges can't increase tuition much. The ratio of public to private tuition is over one to four now, and further rises in private college tuition, except in the prestige colleges, are likely to drive their students into the public sector, making their financial situation more difficult. Increases in public tuition won't help the competitive situation of the private colleges much unless there are big increases in public tuition. Big increases in tuition at public institutions will work at cross purposes to the national commitment to expanding educational opportunities for youth from low-income families. The share of educational costs that should be paid by the student is a complex issue that is likely to be debated for some years to come. What is clear is that the present competitive situation is unbalanced, that the public subsidized system will run the privately supported one out of business soon, unless the competition is made more nearly equal.

The financial requirements for an expanded higher educational system serving 12,000,000 to 13,000,000 Americans in 1980 are less than $80 billion (at 1971 prices). This is only about 2 percent of the projected gross national product, and well within the capability of the nation if America believes in higher education and is willing to support it. In spite of the fact that the country *can* provide the money, it appears that the period of austerity in higher education may last for some time to come. In fact, the crisis will probably last as long as major groups have doubts about the value of higher education, for that is a major underlying cause of money problems. The loss of confidence in higher education is partly due to actions and omissions of the colleges and universities, partly due to the general lack of confidence in the nation's major institutions, and partly due to the college's role as a forum for a broad spectrum of ideas including some unpopular ones. Since colleges and universities should not change the latter, and cannot have much effect on the second, only the first can be changed in ways that will improve the public's image of higher education.

A Challenge to Higher Education

Frank Newman

For those of us in higher education it is clearly a new world. No one would argue that the good old days are likely to return. Instead we must face several new sets of problems which demand our attention. On the one hand there is that set of problems that requires a whole new level of managerial adroitness. From facing student demands to the requirement for more effective policing of the campus, college and university administrations must tackle some tough new on-campus, political-managerial problems. On the other hand, the growing problem of fiscal management looms over our heads. The budget today is king, and university administrators must be financial experts.

Skill in both of these areas is mandatory, a sort of minimum requirement to stay in the game. But neither of these sets of problems deals with the crucial educational dilemmas that confront American higher education in the 1970s.

I

One dilemma arises from our past successes. For 25 years, in an almost unbroken trend, American higher education has grown larger, more open to students of all backgrounds, more productive in its research and scholarship, more highly trained in its faculty, and housed in more beautiful facilities. *But*, we ought to

ask, *has success spoiled American higher education?* Few organizations or societies can undergo such growth or such evolution without developing serious distortions, particularly when there is little outside evaluation or serious self-criticism.

When the post-World War II period started, something on the order of 10 percent of the college age group and perhaps 20 percent of high school graduates entered college. Today something close to 50 percent of the college age group and over 60 per cent of the high school graduates have this opportunity. The cardinal goal of higher education policy has been to create a wider opportunity for access, and we should be justifiably proud of this record.

But is that all there is to the issue? Is the problem of access just about solved? As the Health, Education and Welfare task force studying higher education went through its investigations in 1969-71, we kept finding that the evidence firmly said no.[1] Since greater access is considered so important, we tried to measure its impact. The average figures quoted above are actually made up of states with quite different rates of access, some very high and some very low. Those states in which access to college is in excess of 80 percent of the high school graduates can be examined to get an idea of what the whole national picture may be within a few years.

One stubborn fact refused to go away during our deliberations—after all the effort to provide greater access, most students leave higher education voluntarily. There are, of course, many reasons why students choose to leave college—some marry, some find jobs, some fail at scholastic work, some become sick, some lack the funds to continue, some never intended to finish. But still, when all is said and done, most students leave college because they find it an unattractive and unrewarding experience. We can't avoid this conclusion and we should ask ourselves why it is so.

[1] *Editor's Note*—In 1969, Mr. Newman was appointed by Robert H. Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to head a task force to study higher education reform. The findings published by the task force were popularly known as the "Newman Report."

The issues can be understood somewhat better if one looks at where this attrition occurs. Unfortunately, within higher education we have spent little time worrying about the dissatisfied students who leave. What energy we have has been spent first on measuring access, and whatever was left was spent on the attitudes of the surviving students. A better knowledge of the data does help. For example, it is clear that the rate of attrition is very much different at the most selective and at the least selective institutions.

At the most selective institutions—the prestigious private universities—over 80 percent of those who enter as freshmen graduate within four years at the same institution. At the least selective institutions, about 20 percent continue through graduation at the same institution at which they were enrolled as freshmen. And the more or less straight-line decline in the graduation rates (or increase in the attrition rates) can be noted as one moves from the selective to the somewhat selective to the not-so-selective to the least selective institutions.

If graduation within ten years and at any institution is measured, rather than graduation at just the institution at which the student first enrolled, the same relationship of persistance to the selectivity of the student's original admission would still be found. On this basis between 10 and 15 percent more all along the line move on to graduation, but the graph looks about the same.

The use of the word *selective*, rather than *better* or *prestigious*, is significant. It means that the admissions departments of these institutions are able to select a limited number of entrants and this is done primarily on the basis of their ability to do academic work. One of the great errors that has crept into our thinking gradually over the past several decades is to confuse academic skill with an individual's general effectiveness. Obviously there is some correlation between being bright as measured by A's and some measure of all-around ability, but it's far from a one-to-one correlation. Not only do a growing number of studies indicate that people who are poor at their school work may well be very effective performers in life, but common sense tells us

the same. A recent story in a national magazine gave an intimate portrait of a young man in Harlem running a multi-million dollar dope ring. The organizational, financial and political requirements of that job are considerable indeed. A man who can master that task cannot be described as "ineffective," but, as one might suspect, he was a high school dropout who apparently had little interest in academic work. If the moral questions are left aside for a moment and effectiveness is thought of in terms of ability to handle a complex task, what percentage of Ph.D.s graduating in political science could handle this job?

But in higher education the term "selective institutions" still describes selection of students by the prime characteristic of ability to do well in academic endeavors. Conversely, in less selective institutions the primary characteristic by which students are selected (in this case, selection is represented by this being the only type of institution they are eligible to attend) is that they have not demonstrated a particular aptitude for academic work. So it is not surprising that at selective institutions, students generally enjoy, or at least succeed at, their college work and persist. It would be surprising if this were not so.

II

What is surprising is that we insist on applying the same teaching pattern—the same learning format—for students in all types of institutions. There are a great many ways of learning. Some students learn effectively by doing scholastic work organized around a particular job, which serves both as a practical laboratory to apply what is learned in class and a source of motivation to take up a new subject. Others learn by special forms of task orientation in which the problem may be academic in nature, but everything is organized around a major task—the study of biology in a particular area, or the examination of the ecology movement as a means of understanding the working of government. There are many other methods for learning. We tend to forget that most of them are in wide use throughout the rest

of our society—in industry, the military, athletics, etc.

But at the very time the spectrum of students entering higher education is becoming broader and the demand for differing learning styles more urgent, the institutions are becoming narrower. For the first time, institutions called "colleges" must deal with most of the population's skills and interests, instead of only a narrow segment. Over 1,500,000 students a year now enter college, and their ability to learn from the commonplace classroom format varies enormously.

Yet the nature of our institutions is becoming ever more similar. In the task force's *Report on Higher Education*, we called this the *homogenization of the institutions of higher education.* Whereas we formerly had colleges with specialized purposes (though this range of difference among institutions was much less than we were led to believe), gradually these specialized missions are being replaced by the standardized college with a general purpose format. One example is the night law school.

The night law school has had an ancient and honorable place in our society. It had two purposes. The first, of course, was to train lawyers. The second was to provide a means of upward mobility for students from the lower middle or lower classes. To the best of my knowledge, no one has ever demonstrated that students from night law schools have not done as well at practicing law or have not made as much contribution to our society as students who have gone to day law schools. Whatever meager evidence is available seems to lean slightly in the opposite direction, though it is far from conclusive either way. Yet, largely through the pressures of accrediting agencies, night law schools all around the country are being forced to shift into day law schools and to become part of more conventional institutions—or to close down. Why?

Of course, the missions of many older specialized colleges are no longer appropriate. Less concern over religious matters has been matched by a decline in the specialized religious mission of many colleges. But new missions should be coming to the fore as a broader spectrum of students arrives to be educated. The powerful trend toward homogenization continues, undermining

useful existing specialized institutions (as in the case of the night law schools) and inhibiting new missions.

III

At the same time, learning styles within these more generalized colleges have been undergoing a trend toward standardization—what we called the *professionalization of learning.* Learning is increasingly organized in the traditional academic disciplines (economics, sociology, history, physics, etc.), even when it is not necessarily a logical course of action to follow. But equally important is the trend toward the classroom-lecture style of teaching, treating all subjects in an abstract way. There are powerful reasons why this trend has become the order of the day, of course. It is easy for the institutions and the faculty. We have also reached the point at which it is easier for the students, who have been socialized to this learning format in 13 years of schooling. They understand full well that the role of the professor is to give them "the word" and their role is to regurgitate it in examinations. It is comforting to know the rules of the game.

But for too many students, the routine classroom-lecture format is an ineffective form of teaching. Even for good students, it often fails to engender questioning and rigorous thinking, and a sense of achievement is frequently lacking. If we are going to meet the needs of the 1970s, we must think in terms of new diversity of both institutional missions and teaching styles.

It would be wrong to imply there is no counter trend. There are a number of institutions attempting new missions and teaching styles. Unfortunately, they are few in number and tend to concentrate on the wrong students. At least the present homogenized college works reasonably well for the most academically interested students. It works the poorest with the student uninterested in academic work, just as one might suspect. It is here that the most can be achieved by varying institutional and teaching approaches to the needs of the students. It is here also where higher education it-

self perhaps can do the most for the student.

There is increasing evidence that the "best" students are not as affected by their college experience as has been thought. The few studies that have been done, indicate that students of very high academic ability who do not go to college, learn almost as much and develop almost as well as those who do.

Where those new and differing institutions exist and adapt themselves to do an effective job with the non-academic student, the evidence seems to be that they can help those students learn how to learn and develop as individuals.

Another distortion that may be seen as higher education continues to grow is the slowness in accepting the value of educational experiences that take place outside the conventional setting. While a great deal of relatively formal education takes place in industry, in hospitals, and particularly in the armed forces, rarely do we see this as *real* education, which we think takes place only on accredited campuses.

Perhaps the best example is our ambivalent relationship to continuing education. While the whole process of continuing education has been growing steadily in numbers of students, and range of subjects, it remains firmly confined to a second-, or even third-rate, status in the academic hierarchy. Only when our British counterparts began to establish the possibility of a college experience completely outside the regular campus did we ourselves consider seriously a fuller range of possibilities.

Quite rightly many educators point out that going to college involves a range of activities much broader than simple, direct instruction. There is some evidence that more learning takes place on a peer-to-peer basis than on a faculty-student basis. If learning can take place in an industrial setting, at someone's home or in armed forces programs, why can't college education be effective through peer-to-peer and other non-traditional learning experiences? There is something indeed of value in living at a college campus, but we need to recognize that it is not the only place for learning to take place.

IV

A great deal of attention has recently been given to the tendency of graduate education to become more involved in its own concerns than those of society. The recent problem of the oversupply of Ph.D. graduates has made this obvious.

One can and should argue that much undergraduate education is designed as a general background for the student—the well recognized, general value of a liberal education. Graduate education on the other hand follows 17 years of generalized education and one assumes a reasonable degree of career orientation should be involved.

The academic world commonly explains the oversupply problem in terms of a temporary softness in the market. Or to put it another way, when the nation realizes the need it has for trained scholarly researchers and funds their employment adequately, there will be no oversupply. Here again the facts stubbornly refuse to fit the explanation. For example, when the task force looked at the rate of growth of the Ph.D. programs over the last decade, we found that the fastest growing were those fields in which Ph.D.s had been in oversupply for the better part of the decade—English, modern languages, history, etc. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that factors of academic prestige—the desire to transform a college to a university, the reward structure of publish or perish—have played a much stronger role than the needs of society.

Higher education is faced with many problems in addition to those we have examined. They include: the growing domination of higher education by large multicampus systems with their tendency toward bureaucracy and political intrusion; the tendency to view the community colleges as screening devices for the universities rather than educational institutions in themselves; and the unwillingness to consider the intellectual problems of how effectively resources are used. All these problems cry for attention, for tough-minded analysis, and for imaginative new solutions.

But there is a danger. In seeking rational solutions we are apt to end up thinking in mechanistic terms—

higher education as a business investment, or education doled out on the basis of sheer, hard-nosed logic. For example, if large numbers drop out at the unselective institutions, we may conclude that we are trying to educate too many students. If too many faculty members want to encourage Ph.D. programs for the sake of their own prestige, then perhaps we ought to cut out all graduate education. Somehow we must avoid this kind of thinking. We *do* need a hard-nosed approach to the analysis of higher education. We *do* need to raise the tough-minded, difficult-to-answer questions that we have been avoiding. In so doing, however, we also must have the courage to recognize the complexities and subtleties of the educational process.

There is indeed a great value in a generalized liberal arts education for many students. Learning to learn has broad values not just for the student, but for society. We can't measure the value of education solely in terms of the student's increased earnings during his lifetime. Perhaps we can't even measure it accurately at all that way. So it is necessary for us to ask some other questions of higher education that may be even more difficult to analyze because they deal with this fundamental problem of what education is all about.

One such question is whether many students are learning anything of serious use to themselves from the classroom in the average college in the United States. There is, of course, no simple answer, but that makes it no less important to raise the question. And does this have anything at all to do with career choice after college? Isn't it just as important for an appliance repair man to be able to think analytically as it is for a lawyer? Both are citizens and one might argue that more heartache and cost come from bad appliance repair than from poor legal advice!

A second question must be asked about the assumption that the logical way to go to college is in an unbroken stretch from high school through whatever was the final degree. Great effort and expense have been expended to allow students this opportunity. Obviously for some this pattern is not only an appropriate, but a satisfying pattern. For others it may be self-defeating.

Growing evidence suggests that many students coming out of high school are bored, dissatisfied, unready for college in every way. We need to find ways to make it socially legitimate for them to go off and do something else—work, join the Peace Corps, travel, almost anything as long as it is not going to college. When they are ready, then they should be encouraged to go to college.

Many students part way through their undergraduate training might benefit from a break in their education, as well as many who go on to graduate training directly after graduation. The task force found that large numbers of graduate students are following this lockstep pattern, often against their wishes. Among other things, they frequently slide by their career choices and discover too late in the game that they have prepared themselves elaborately for a career in which they are not really interested.

One disadvantage of the lockstep pattern is that students are spending longer and longer in college and college is becoming more and more isolated from the rest of society. It is apparent that many students see college as a means to a life style rather than a preparation for life in society. The task force was frankly astonished at the number of students who are anxious to hang on at the campus, go on to graduate school in program after program, or, if worst comes to worst, simply hang on by living in the campus environs as part of a growing, floating population. All of this seems to be a part of the avoidance of that fateful moment when one is forced to leave the university for a seemingly hostile outside world.

There's a long and deep tradition in American life that college is a place for growing up in preparation for an active role in our society. We assume that the college graduate is bursting with desire to prove himself, to achieve. While we have recognized that the vehicles and goals of achievement change over a period of time, we still assume that in a broad sense achievement and service to society remain a cornerstone of the values of a college graduate.

While we have little evidence to go by, we can't avoid recognizing that something seems to be going wrong

with this assumption. More and more college students do not seem anxious to achieve, do not seem interested in getting on with the work of the world, whatever that work might be. Despite the espousal of the importance of cleaning up our environment, rebuilding our cities, making our planet livable, and ending the war, a great many students seem to view these as tasks to be taken on by institutions—by colleges, universities, and government—but not by students personally.

It may well be that students who come to college from an increasingly affluent, intellectual and pleasant life in the suburbs may never undergo a life experience that prepares them for a role in society or develops their belief that achievement is an important personal value. Perhaps this is the most fundamental challenge that faces American higher education. It may be that we must have a whole new view of what the tasks of higher education are. It may not be enough to provide an intellectually stimulating experience, but a range of experiences that prepares a student more adequately for life.

We tend to assume that the tasks of higher education are immutable, but they have been changing since the first college was established in this country in 1636. At that time the fundamental role of college was to prepare puritan youngsters for the ministry. Since then the function of college education has evolved in many directions. For awhile, it prepared young men from wealthy families for careers in making money, with perhaps a little effort spent in civic leadership.

Today we may have to face a whole new task. It may be that the most important role of higher education in the 1970s will be to prepare students to rise above the life of affluence so that they can achieve in an increasingly complex world.

Educational Reform and Social Change: A Student Perspective

John Gaventa

Perhaps I should begin by saying that recently I was in the mountains of Appalachia in East Tennessee. The specific place is less significant than the fact that I was in an environment outside the university. From that world, those mountains, some of the problems of higher education seem remote. From those mountains, I am quickly fatigued and even despaired by a myopic insistence to deal with the common stock of educational headaches—with numbers, or finances, or the crisis of public confidence, or lockstep or the rest. I am fatigued by these not because they are insignificant or simple, but because of their isolation from fundamental questions of where we are going out in the "mountains," out in the nation as a whole.

From out in the "mountains," I get a renewed recognition of the need for social transformation, for fundamental alteration in our priorities, values, and way of life. I have a weariness of educational reports that fail to put educational reform within the context of crucial social needs, and I share a commitment found among growing numbers of my generation. Beginning with the civil rights movement; continuing in the free speech movement; growing in anti-war protest, the McCarthy campaign and the Chicago convention; spreading from Columbia to Berkeley and even to us in the South; challenging every political, educational, religious, and social institution, indeed, our very social fabric; climaxing, following Kent and Jackson, in the largest outburst of

student protest in the nation's history, this student commitment has asserted itself again and again with energy, with idealism, and sometimes with violence. And so in talking of the future of higher education from the perspective of that commitment, I must also talk of the future of the nation; in talking of educational reformation, I must also talk of social change.

The crisis on American campuses has no parallel in the history of the nation. . . So read the opening words of the Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. What is the nature of that crisis? It is not, as it has been mesmerized, the crisis of campus or student unrest, for these are rooted in and are a reflection of national unrest. Neither is the campus crisis identical with the national crisis, for certainly universities have problems of their own. No, the unique crisis of the campus brings together the campus and the nation. The crisis is whether the university as an institution can fulfill its potential to be an instrumental part of social growth, whether it can overcome the conditions of national unrest, whether as an enterprise it can provide the educational experience that can develop the attitudes and skills necessary to deal with fundamental social change. Or put more simply, the crisis of American higher education is whether it will be part of the problem or part of the solution in the struggle to change where we are going out in the mountains.

It is my belief, and the belief I think of many students, that most of the institutions of higher education are presently part of the problem, part of the social crisis. I make that statement also believing deeply in higher education's potential for response and deeply committed to the avoidance of politicalization or destruction of the valuable aspects of an awesome tradition. Why do I hold this position? I will attempt an explanation by first looking further at the nature of the student commitment and what it has to say of social directions; secondly, by examining the potential and response of higher education to deal with the campus crisis, and, finally, by attempting to provide some guidelines and possibilities for educational reform in the future. Much of my approach will be philosophical, seeking a basis for later discussion and specifically intertwining the

mutual issues of educational reformation and social change.

I

The year 1970-71 brought an unexplainable quietness to campuses across the country. On the surface, at least to skeptics, the quiet perhaps gave the activities of previous years a stamp of inauthenticity or erraticness. Yet, to sensitive observers and participants, the quiet was a sign of deeper discontent, for it was characterized by a malaise, a despair, a highly personal turning inward or to sensitive others, a giving up on our leaders, our institutions, and possibilities for constructive change. That quiet, though, left time for re-examination of the student commitment of the 1960s and allowed us to learn of new directions for change in the 1970s.

Many explanations have been offered for the phenomenon of student activism. However, recent research on the level of moral reasoning of students provides fresh insight, I think, into the nature of the student activity. *Moral reasoning* does not mean conformity to a particular moral ideal or code, but *how* one holds a particular value and the *process* of reasoning that leads to certain behavior. The psychologist Lawrence Kohlberg suggests that moral reasoning has three different levels. The first—the pre-moral stage—is basically hedonistic, motivated by desire for physical gratification, and possesses little concern for standards or persons. The second—the conventional stage—finds moral value in performing socially acceptable roles and is characterized by a "good-boy" orientation, with emphasis on law and order and unquestioning obedience to established authorities such as family, church, or government. The third and highest stage—the post-conventional morality—finds moral values in highly developed personal principles. It is characterized by a dual recognition of a binding social contract among men and of the values of individual choice, obedience to conscience, and empathy with others.

In applying these stages of moral reasoning to students, it has been found that a small minority are of the pre-conventional stage. Their motivation is highly selfish

and ego-deficient; they are rebellious, but often for their own gratification. These pre-moralists think primarily of personal wants, are insensitive to others, and carry on personal power battles with a society seen as ungiving rather than as immoral. Persons in the conventional group, the largest of the three, live their lives in expected ways. They value social acceptance and practicality. They model themselves after their parents, adopt the traditional priorities of American society, and emphasize nonskeptical, harmonious relationships with social institutions and personal authorities. The post-conventional group places high value on ideals, creativity, personal sensitivity, and human fulfillment. Highly developed as autonomous individuals, they find their motivation not out of need-deficiency, but out of concern for a quality and depth of being. Unlike the pre-moralists, their thought has the properties of consistency, universality and concern for others. Their struggle is not based primarily on power, but on the realization, both personally and politically, of higher levels of human development.

Now what does this suggest about the student commitment to change? The application of these stages of moral development to such student protests as the free speech movement in California indicates that the majority of the protestors were of a higher level of ethical development than the non-protestors. As Kenneth Keniston, Yale psychologist, testified before the President's Commission on Campus Unrest, "Activism on our campuses, whether constructive or destructive, springs not primarily from psychopathology, the impersonality of the multiversity, parental permissiveness, poor education, hedonism, or many of the other negative reasons to which it has been ascribed. For the great majority of students, activism is first and foremost a morally based reaction against unjust practices, policies and institutions in American society." And at the core of this student commitment for change has been a profoundly ethical concern for the realization of the ideals of our society, its institutions, and its people. Indeed, in the context of the inadequacies and injustices of our national condition, the higher the level of education and ethical development, the more likely, and the

more obliged, were students to dissent.

The student commitment pointed not only to old failures but also to fresh possibilities facing our nation. Gabriel Marcel, French existentialist, writes that civilizations of men develop through three stages (analogous to those of Kohlberg). The first is the struggle for satisfaction of fundamental physical needs such as food, clothing, shelter. The second is the objectification of man over and against his environment through the accumulation of wealth, the growth of technology and the drive for prestige and power. The third and highest stage is that of human fulfillment through creativity, thought, and development of human community of a quality not to be found in function or in things. The much acclaimed Consciousness I, II, and III developed by Charles Reich in the *Greening of America* are roughly similar to the stages suggested by Marcel.

At the core of the student commitment for change and springing from the post-conventional ethics is a commitment to the realization of the third stage of civilization. And for the first time in history, I believe, we are able to talk realistically about the ability to attain this highest ethic as a nation.

Why the new possibilities? A host of historical and social forces are at work. However, one force stands out. In examining human motivation, Robert Maslow, an existential psychologist, presents a hierarchy of needs, ranging from satisfaction of basic physical wants, to acceptance by others, to self-fulfillment through the development of highly sensitive personal relationships, creativity and cognitive richness. Only when the basic needs are filled can man move from motivation founded in ego-deficiency to motivation founded in a concern for the depth and quality of being. The increased affluence, education, and technology of post-industrial society has allowed, I believe, more widespread gratification of basic physical and personality needs, freeing man to these new sources of motivation and to greater possibilities of human growth. New historical forces have given substance to what otherwise may have been mere dreams of technocracy's children.

Societies, powers and institutions, however, seem un-

able to cope with such human development. Our structures, our culture, our priorities seem set on deterring rather than enhancing new affirmation of human life. We spend over half of our national budget on a military death machine and on absurd, meaningless destruction of unknown proportions in Southeast Asia. We seem more concerned about material accumulation, prestige, and function, than the quality of our own lives. Cultural and political repression threaten the freedom to be different from the conventional ethic. Competition and consumption for their own sake lead to rat-race ruts of meaninglessness. There is little room for human development in this world of massive, organized and coldly rational technological objectification.

Yes, if there is anything said by campus unrest, it is that life-styles and institutions have grown hollow in the face of new values and possibilities. And so the student commitment for the 1970s—indeed, the national commitment—needs to be, I think, to work for the radical adaptation of institutions and priorities toward the affirmation of human growth and the transition to a third stage of human civilization. At the heart of this challenge lies the challenge to the future of higher education.

II

One is led then to ask: Where are the universities now in this struggle for social change? Are they a part of the deterrence or a part of the enhancement? In a unique sense, the responsibility for stimulating the individual and society towards new dimensions of human growth lies with higher education, and, primarily, within the tradition of a liberal arts education. Certainly, the responsibility is not solely that of higher learning, nor is it the only responsibility of universities, yet, perhaps no other single social institution contains the tradition and the resources for the job.

Why? Essential to any notion of education is the responsibility of the search for truth and the transmission of it. That process itself is the core to social transition, for it is through a commitment to truth and free inquiry that we are able to question conventionality, to understand new possibilities, and to play, if necessary, a role

of opposition to the dominant values of society. The very process of liberal education implies an experience of "liberation" from hollow tradition, a process of envisioning alternatives to worn-out convention.

Or as Charles Frankel, philosopher and social critic at Columbia University, has written:

"Liberal education is an instrument by which we try to make students imagine alternatives—alternatives to what they think and feel, alternatives to the status quo, alternatives to the existing premises of thought and conditions in their society, alternatives to the established theories and intellectual routines of the disciplines in which they receive their instruction. Liberal education is, in this sense, liberating.

"The great social function of liberal education, its genuine relevance and applicability, is precisely to alter these conventional notions of social utility. These are usually the products of existing routines. They are responses to the momentum of existing institutions, expressing a prevailing constellation of intellect and ideology. A liberal education that leaves these conceptions untouched is not a liberal education."

Surely, then, the success of the educational experience and institution is measured by what they do to facilitate human liberation, to free us to conceive and live new possibilities, to enhance human growth. All other functions may be considered against that end.

Despite the tradition and despite the unique responsibility, liberal education has failed in the present system. Rather than a liberating experience, it is a captivating one; rather than freeing persons to new alternatives or quality of life, it more often than not trains them, in a dehumanized and effective way, to become an extension of conventional society. As Harold Taylor well puts it, "The most common way of educating students is to take them as they are and leave them that way." Not just the educational experience but the higher education system—the body of power, institutions, and organizations that have grown up around the experience—has become contradictory to its very ideals and a deterrence to its purpose. Until education in this country can begin to fulfill its potential of liberation, we must share Frankel's conclusion that it is "largely dead—its hu-

manistic heartbeat has failed and rigor mortis set in throughout the giant educational system."

What are some specific examples of this rigor mortis and how do they relate to the social context? Let me offer four illustrations, defining in each the social need and the possibility and the failures of higher education's response.

The first need is for the enhancement of cultural diversity and the development of understanding of and appreciation for ways of life different from our own. This is the need to combat attitudes of racism and elitism and allow all persons in our society to go beyond the limitations of their environment, whether those limitations be the economic poverty of the ghetto or the isolated poverty of the suburb.

One could expect a liberal education to provide a response to this need. Here is an institution dedicated to free inquiry, intellectual difference and the rationality of man, regardless of social privilege. Here is an opportunity for students to re-examine their own values and assumptions. Here, if anywhere, one expects response to a desperate social need.

And what do we find? That the university is a part of the problem and the educational experience perpetuates the attitudes which allow it to exist. When 13 black institutions in the South are about to lose their cultural identities because the racist system had to have white schools, then something is wrong. When quality education exists primarily for the elite and when mass education leads to mass homogeneity, then we are failing. How can a liberal education in Frankel's sense be possible at a place where a predominately white Southern student body goes four years without coming into contact with students or faculty who are different from what they have known? And how can we say such institutions are part of the solution when, for example, they hire black recruiters but fail to give them the resources to be effective in their work? Or how can we applaud a President's commitment to education for disadvantaged students when that commitment only allows attending mediocre schools? In the face of tremendous possibilities for the development of appreciation of cultural di-

versity, the elitist higher education system continues to maintain a single image of success and compartmentalizes other groups on that scale.

A second need for the future is the need to combat the meaninglessness of the techno-bureaucratic world. What is the nature of the meaninglessness? Much, it seems to me, lies in the lack of national vision to go beyond technology, to use it as an instrument serving human growth rather than as an end in itself. Examples of the problem are numerous: increased time and distance between labor and product; remoteness of decisions and forces that vitally affect one's life; the technological ethic that says something ought to be done because it is technologically possible; and emphasis on over-accumulation as a symbol of success.

Here, again, we expect the educational experience to develop attitudes that combat the problem. And yet, we find that the university procedures and priorities have become infused as a part of the technological world. The knowledge explosion produces knowledge for its own sake with little regard for how it becomes an integral part of the developing individual. Skills for social and technological advancement become the educational goal, and, as George Leonard writes, "Concentration on technical proficiency has become one of the best ways to avoid awareness of the self." Overemphasis on certification and extrinsic reward systems confuse symbol with substance, technique with value. Curriculum, governance and teaching patterns rarely view the student as able to contribute to his own learning experience. Rather than activating minds to search for new knowledge and values, our educational approach seems to reward passiveness and conformity.

Robert Hutchins well summarized this failure: "In form the modern university is largely pre-industrial. Its organization and tradition originated in the middle ages. In aim the modern university is industrial. It trains the technicians required by the industrial state. But its students will live in a society that is post-industrial, a society that is beginning to take shape but that may be decades in the making."

The American educational system produced the knowl-

edge that developed the technological world. Education now needs to develop people who can bring life to it, people who can find meaning independent of role or function, who have discovered the meaning of creativity and self-discovery, who can develop a sense of wholeness in the bringing together of thought and feeling, who can bring flourish and life to technological objectification.

A third social need, underlying the other two, I shall term *fragmentation*—fragmentation of values, and knowledge, and each from the other. Out of such fragmentation develops, I believe, basic inconsistencies and irresponsibilities. Seeded by specialization, this social phenomenon is exemplified by the professor who rationalizes that he is too specialized in the field of management—indeed, too educated in the relation of human beings—to take a position on the loss of human life in Southeast Asia. This phenomenon is spawned by bureaucracies that allow fundamental contradictions in their own purposes and operations—such as TVA working on the one hand for effective land use and beautification and, on the other hand, encouraging horrendous strip mining destruction. This is the fragmentation of human experience that annhilates coherence and harmony, that divides feeling from thought, responsibility from position, oneself from self and others.

And yet one wonders if this fragmentation is not encouraged and even reflected in how we are educated. Specialization and compartmentalization, purportedly in response to the needs of the technological world, reflect themselves throughout the educational experience. Learning is divided from society into schools, from schools to departments, from departments to areas, from areas to course numbers, to days of the week, to particular hours in particular classrooms through particular methods (usually by particularly dull professors). Little time is allowed for the synthesis of knowledge, experience, and values. Problem-centered learning is left stranded by the rigidity of departmental organization. Alfred Whitehead wrote years ago that "the result of teaching small parts of a large number of subjects is the passive reception of disconnected ideas, not illuminated by any spark of vitality." It may be that in the

1970s society as a whole reflects the lesson of Whitehead's insight.

To deal with the fourth need is essential to dealing with any of the needs developed thus far. Some students and others have given embryonic vision to new possibilities and directions for change. We desperately need concrete manifestations—living proof—of these possibilities. We need social institutions and practices that demonstrate alternatives to the status quo conventional society.

In an ideal situation, universities could offer alternatives and use their resources to conceptualize and encourage alternatives in other institutional forms. But higher education has failed in that role; it has perpetuated the conditions that it should combat.

The reason for the failure is that higher education is dependent upon and shaped by power structures and economic resources not of its own but of the social environment. College and university boards are generally composed of the monied representatives of society; their resources come from the federal and state governments vulnerable to political exploitation, from endowments invested in economic power structures, from rich and vociferous alumni. They are a part of and controlled by those very forces they might otherwise be able to affect.

We are faced with a discouraging treadmill. Before universities can demonstrate and create alternatives, they must find some alternative to their own resource dependencies. Yet, before those alternatives can exist, there must be an educational system that encourages social change. In this intertwining dilemma lies the crisis of higher education.

The crisis in higher education is whether or not our universities will fulfill their potential as agents for social growth. And that crisis finds its roots in the related dilemma: whether or not society itself will have the wisdom and courage to allow colleges and universities the freedom and resources to fulfill that potential. Only in recognizing the full import of this dual crisis can we look fruitfully at the directions for education in the future.

III

What of higher education of the future? What would a student committed to social change like to see? To give a complete picture is beyond my ability; however, I can give a general idea.

We seek a university which is a part of a social transformation; that liberates the individual to live alternatives to conventional society; that enhances and encourages the development of a post-conventional ethic; that goes beyond reflection and perpetuation to the solution of social needs; and that, to use Faulkner's phrase, not just endures but prevails. The university of the future should work for the development and appreciation of diversity. It should give coherence to a world of fragmentation by relating knowledge to values and human experiences. It should not just train technicians for a technological society, but educate persons to bring life to that society. It should seek alternatives to the conventional world. And it should succeed in each of these without politicalization and without destruction of valuable aspects of its tradition.

Yet, these characteristics are general, limited to long-range and idealistic vision. We must, to be effective in our concern for social change and education reform, turn to specific, pragmatic strategies of how and by whom changes are to be made. Let me suggest four thoughts which may provide guidelines in the struggle toward the goals I have attempted to develop.

First, universities must be allowed diverse roles and methods to respond effectively to diverse needs and constituencies. Despite the myth of diversity of American higher education, our universities are basically homogenized. Though varied in size and identity, most seek to do essentially the same thing in the same ways. As Riesmann has suggested, American higher education can be understood as a "snake-like" procession with the prestigious elite schools forming the head, followed by the body of the large public institutions, which, in turn, are tailed by the community colleges.

In this context, one reads with relief the statement of the Newman Report that "there is a compelling need

for new approaches to higher education—not only new types of colleges with new missions, but also new patterns of going to college." We must allow flexibility and freedom to educate the black man, and the working poor, as well as the middle class; we must allow the freedom to respond to a variety of needs and efforts for social development.

Secondly, universities should develop a stance of militant resistance to environmental forces that impede their potential as educational institutions. Universities are dependent upon the resources of the external environment and consequently much of what they have become has been molded as much by outside forces as from their own internal volition. For instance, universities are quick to build athletic dormitories simply because a rich alumnus wills the money, or quick to do classified research simply because the Department of Defense has large pools of uninspected budgets available for this purpose.

And yet, universities must realize that not only are they dependent upon society, but society is dependent upon them. They must join forces against social forces that mitigate against the fulfillment of their educational goals.

There is ample historical precedent for such action. Through the American Association of University Professors and other organizations, higher education has stood against violations of freedom of thought and inquiry. Surely there are other educational ideals that demand equally militant and uncompromising responses. For instance, does not the investment in segregationist companies in the Union of South Africa violate fundamental principles of human integrity? Is not the development of knowledge used for destruction and death contradictory to the educational end of human growth? Or, does not the university subvert its basic purpose when its efforts are merely another commodity to be bought and used by those with money and power? If the university is to become part of the process of social transformation, it must begin now, despite costs, to take a stand of aggressive resistance against those forces that contradict its fundamental purpose.

My third point is that internal educational reforms must be devoted not just to the transmission of knowledge but to the process of transmission. Reformation should be based not just on what is learned, but on how the educational process takes place and the attitudes it helps to develop.

In the past, great debate has been waged over what knowledge an "educated" man must possess and what methods of teaching impart the most facts in the shortest period of time. More basic questions now are how one acquires knowledge and what attitudes are brought to bear on its use. We need to develop non-competitive, intrinsic attitudes toward learning. The issue in university governance is not merely order and efficiency, but the encouragement of skills of self-governance and growth in democratic communities . . . and so on.

The fourth guideline for educational reform is that serious pragmatic strategies for change must be developed that recognize the external controls over higher education. Operating under the myth that universities are free to govern themselves, most educational reform movements of the 1960s, focused on the internal structure of the university. Most were unsuccessful because they lacked economic and power resources for change. Simultaneous with the fledgling reform movements, stronger and stronger relationships were being built between the educational establishment and the outside power establishment. Presidents met with presidents; self-interested lobbies grew more and more entrenched; administrators and educational boards infiltrated foundation circles and so on. The result was the failure of the educational reform movement, for as it looked for economic and political support, it found those resources controlled by a well-organized educational establishment—the very presidents, administrators, and tenured faculty it was trying to change. Consequently, any effective move for reform must develop mechanisms of its own for affecting the existing power structure.

But a strategy for reform must go beyond the alliances within the university. Rather, to deal with both educational and social change, reform must ally not only with those within the university but those who are sympa-

thetic without. The challenge for educational change necessitates a commitment not just from students but from all of us to deal with a crisis not just of the campus nor of the nation but of the campus *and* the nation.

The Higher Education of Black Americans for the Decade of the 1970s

Stephen J. Wright

The turbulent 1960s saw four developments that profoundly affected the lives of black Americans for the better: the enactment of landmark federal civil rights laws that eliminated "legal" segregation; a dramatic increase in the number of blacks enrolling in higher education; the opening of new employment opportunities for those with higher education; and the rise of a strong black consciousness, coupled with a dynamic militancy that has yet to be disciplined and focused effectively on specific objectives on a national basis.

An inventory of the general conditions of black Americans at the end of the decade, in a necessarily abbreviated form, indicates that comparatively little improvement in the opportunities for the black, non-college graduate occurred and that discrimination in housing continued to be pervasive. It was also clear that despite the dramatic increase in the number of blacks enrolling in higher education, the disparity between black and white enrollment was still enormous, being progressively acute at the senior college, graduate and professional levels. At the same time, it appeared that the concern of white America for the solution of the problems of black Americans had at best lapsed into "benign neglect," as one Presidential advisor had suggested, or at worst, into hostility toward any further progress toward genuine equality. By the end of the decade, it became clearer than ever before that without equal opportunity in higher education, equal opportunity in the larger

sense was a delusion. For without equal higher education, black Americans cannot compete for jobs in an increasingly sophisticated economy, despite new civil rights laws or black militancy. It is also important to recognize that higher education does much more than prepare individuals to compete for jobs. It improves their style of life, develops leaders, and raises aspirations—for themselves and for their children. For all of these reasons, therefore, equal opportunity in higher education will, in the 1970s, become an increasingly important goal for black Americans.

Equal opportunity in higher education involves not only increasing the percentage of black Americans enrolled in higher education to the percentage of the overall population that is enrolled, but also equal access to institutions of quality and to graduate and professional schools. It also involves the preparation necessary to survive, once access is achieved. As will be indicated later, such a concept of equality of opportunity has implications for admissions practices, financial aid, and—until such time as the quality of their public school education is raised—for special counselling and compensatory education as well.

I

As late as 1900, 90 percent of all black Americans lived in the South. But by 1950 this percentage had dropped to 68, and by 1970 to 52. These changes significantly affected the racial composition of the South, reducing the ratio of blacks to whites from approximately one in three in 1900 to one in five in 1970. Thus, the higher education of blacks for the decade of the 1970s will involve not only the South, but other regions of the nation.

Since 1900, black Americans have constituted about 10 or 11 percent of the American population. In 1970, however, the population reached 23,500,000, or 11.5 percent of the population. And if 11.5 percent of the 8,050,000 enrolled in higher education were black, they would number almost 1,000,000. The fact is, however, that the number is far below this figure.

The best estimate of black enrollment in higher edu-

cation at the beginning of the 1970s is the 470,000 figure used by Fred Crossland in *Minority Access to College*.[1] Estimates have been developed by three agencies—the American Council on Education, the Bureau of the Census, and the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The American Council's estimate is based upon freshman enrollment, the Bureau of the Census figure on an analysis of a sample of 50,000 households, and the Office of Civil Rights calculation on a count in which a number of institutions failed to report. The unfortunate fact is that no one knows the enrollment within a probable error of 10 percent. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the estimate of 470,000 is accurate enough for the purposes of this presentation. In 1930, the figure was approximately 25,000, and it has at least doubled each decade since. From 1960 to 1970, however, the enrollment increased from 205,000 to 470,000, or approximately 230 percent. Despite this dramatic increase, the number enrolled is less than 50 percent of what it should be, assuming that it should be 11.5 percent of the total enrollment in higher education.

A breakdown of the 1970 black enrollment indicates that 160,000, or 34 percent of the estimated 470,000 total, attended traditionally black institutions. Of these, 53,050 (11.3 percent) were enrolled in private senior colleges, 2,950 (.6 percent) in private two-year colleges, 102,025 (21 percent) in public senior colleges, and 1,975 (.4 percent) in public two-year colleges. Some 310,000, or 66 percent, were enrolled in other institutions: 35,000 (7.5 percent) in private senior colleges, 2,000 (.4 percent) in private two-year colleges, 122,000 (26 percent) in public senior colleges, and 151,000 (32.1 percent) in public two-year colleges.

From these figures, it should be noted that only about one-third of the black students were enrolled in traditionally black colleges—a dramatic change since 1950 when approximately 85 percent were enrolled in these institutions. Nearly one-third were enrolled in public two-year colleges and approximately 80 percent in public institutions. When compared with those of former years, these statistics also suggest that an increasing percentage of black students will be educated in predominantly white colleges—perhaps as much as 95 percent of those

residing outside the South. An increasing percentage of black students will at least begin their higher education in two-year public institutions, which will make the transfer problem to senior colleges and universities critical. But it is clear that while the *percentage* of black students enrolled in traditionally black colleges has decreased, the *number* of enrolled has *increased,* which means that the traditionally black colleges still play a significant role in the education of black students, particularly in the South where 52 percent of black Americans still live and where the admission of black students to predominantly white institutions is, for several reasons, likely to be slower than that of the rest of the nation.

What these statistics do not show is the critical disparity of black students at the graduate and professional levels. Some examples will illustrate the situation.[2] In 1969, only two percent of the practicing physicians in the United States and only 2.8 percent of the candidates for M.D. degrees were black. In the same year, only 1.72 percent of the graduate students in the arts and sciences were black and only .78 percent of the Ph.D.s given between 1964 and 1968 were awarded to black students. Furthermore, less than 3,500 black Americans hold academic doctorate degrees, or about 11 percent of the number awarded to white Americans in the year 1968. The situation is very much the same in dentistry, law, engineering, business administration and other professional fields.

In summary, education, and especially higher education, is the foundation of equality in America, and the enrollment of black students in higher education must be more than doubled if their enrollment is to be equal to the percentage of blacks in the population. At the graduate and professional levels the disparity coefficient is not two, as it is at the undergraduate level, but something on the order of four or six. An increasing percentage of black students will, in the future, be educated in predominantly white public institutions, and redressing the imbalance of black students in higher education is bound to become one of the goals of organized efforts on the part of black Americans in the 1970s.

II

The path toward equalizing educational opportunity for black Americans will, inevitably, be strewn with barriers and problems.

The barriers include lack of money to finance higher education, high admissions standards, deprivation associated with race and poverty, "whiteness" on the predominantly white campuses, and the indifference of state legislatures and governing boards.

Of these, the barrier of money is perhaps the most formidable. The annual cost of attending residential private institutions is approximately $4,000, for public institutions about $2,200 and probably as low as $1,000 for public community colleges, and all are rising. At the same time, nearly 45 percent of black American families have annual incomes of less than $5,000. It is, therefore, evident that unless the federal government, perhaps in cooperation with state governments, provides adequate financial aid on a stable basis, there is no hope that the enrollment imbalance will be corrected in the foreseeable future, even if all other barriers are removed. The magnitude of the need is simply too great for private philanthropy.

High admissions standards, coupled with inadequate public school preparation, exclude very many black students from a great number of predominantly white colleges—the institutions in which the overwhelming majority of any major increase would enroll. If this barrier is to be broken, one or more developments must occur. The predominantly white colleges, especially the publicly supported colleges, must move toward at least a modified open admissions policy. Or the public school education of black students must be dramatically improved and the counselling made much more responsive to the needs of the students. A third alternative is to enlarge black colleges and greatly expand their curricula. Of the three possibilities, there may be more probability of the predominantly white colleges changing their admissions requirements—especially in those areas where there are no black colleges.

The new policy of open admissions of the City University of New York may mark a new trend, if suc-

cessful. In the meantime, it is to be hoped that steps will be taken to make public school education much more accountable. Unfortunately, there is little basis for hoping or expecting the black colleges to be greatly enlarged or their curricula expanded. On the contrary, the private black college, with few exceptions, is the most threatened institution of higher learning, and the future of the black public college is far from being clear. [3]

The barrier of deprivation, associated with race and poverty, is complex and stubborn. Children from homes without close relatives who have had college training seldom see the relationship between education and satisfying careers And those from homes at or near the poverty level seldom have any realistic hope of entering college and lack the benefit of educational support from their parents in the form of language development, reading materials, educationally informative conversations or adequate study conditions. These are conditions that the public schools have done little or nothing to compensate for.

The "barrier of whiteness" is the atmosphere which black students encounter on predominantly white campuses. One student in a Northeastern college referred to the situation as "wall-to-wall whiteness". Black students tend to describe the atmosphere as hostile, the curricula as irrelevant, and the non-instructional program as being unresponsive to their needs.[4] This assessment of the situation may change as more black students enroll and more black faculty are added.

The indifference of legislatures and governing boards to the enormous and expensive problem of equalizing educational opportunity for black students may be a reflection of the indifference of the larger public. While it is true that North Carolina recently appropriated $2,300,000 in "catch-up" funds for its five black state colleges and the state of Mississippi $600,000 for Mississippi Valley State College in 1968, these amounts scarcely touch the total problem of financial aid, admissions policies of the predominantly white state colleges, and the black student's need for special counselling and compensatory education.[5]

III

Any consideration of the future higher education of black Americans must take into account the role of the black college. In the future, it will undoubtedly accommodate an increasingly smaller percentage of the total number of black students. The absolute number of students will doubtless increase, however, particularly in the public institutions. Attempts are being made, as in the case of Sander vs. Ellington in Tennessee, to "dismantle" the dual system, but it is by no means clear that black institutions will be substantially enlarged or strengthened. Indeed, the extent to which they will remain predominantly black is in question—West Virginia State College, Bluefield State College (West Virginia) and Lincoln University (Missouri) having already become predominantly white.

The private black colleges, with few exceptions, are threatened by what might be called built-in deficits. Serving an economically disadvantaged group, they simply cannot charge tuition equal to that of their white counterparts. Yet they must compete for students, teachers and funds designed to assist black students.

Both private and public black colleges were indispensable in the past because they were the only institutions of higher learning fully open to black Americans. In addition, they kept their fees within the reach of the majority of the students, provided significant financial aid and developed the great majority of the leaders of the black community. No one who is acquainted with the history and accomplishments of these institutions doubts that they can, for the indefinite future, play a significant role in the education of black students. The private black colleges will, however, need a great deal more financial support than they have received in the past, or the majority will inevitably deteriorate and a substantial number will be forced to close.

There is one development—or strongly advocated proposal—that should be mentioned. According to Gerald Bullock, the black college must first "prepare its students for full and efficient participation in a WASP-dominated society from whose overpowering influence they cannot escape; second, it must train them for a

world of blackness in which they must live. . . They (the colleges) must accept American racism as a barrier to assimilation, and they must prepare students to deal intelligently with this barrier. This means that these colleges must transmit two cultures rather than one. . ."[6] Other advocates of this position include Vincent Harding and Gerald McWorter.[7] If this is a viable direction for the colleges to move—and there is serious question as to whether this can be done in public institutions—then this new direction will become a unique role.

IV

I have predicted that black Americans will mount an organized effort during the 1970s to achieve equal higher educational opportunity. I expect an effort will be made to secure far more representation on state boards and more offices in the administrative structure of higher education. Attempts will be made to move public institutions toward policies of open admissions and to secure permanent legislation at the state and federal levels for adequate, stable student financial aid based on need. Pressure will be applied to improve counselling and teaching at the secondary level and to make the curricula of institutions of higher learning more responsive to the needs of black students. At the same time, an effort will be made to increase significantly the number of black administrators and teachers in predominantly white colleges and universities, while preserving selected institutions as black colleges or universities.

The big task during the 1970s will be to convince white America that equal higher education for black Americans is an investment rather than a charity, a means of breaking the self-perpetuating poverty cycle and an insurance against the "social dynamite" that characterized the black ghetto in the 1960s. This will not be an easy task and it probably will not be fully accomplished. Its degree of success will be easily measured by the extent to which young black Americans have equal access to the range and quality of America's institutions of higher learning.

[1] Adapted from Fred E. Crossland, *Minority Access to College*, p. 33.
[2] *From Isolation to Mainstream: Problems of the Colleges Founded for Negroes*, a report and recommendations by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971, pp. 31-32.
[3] John Edgerton has pointed this out very cogently in his monograph, *The Black Public Colleges: Integration and Disintegration.*
[4] See *The Minority Student on the Campus*, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education and Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1971.
[5] Winfred Godwin, "Southern State Governments and Higher Education for Negroes" *Daedalus*, Summer 1971, pp. 783-797.
[6] Henry Allen Bullock, "The Black College and the New Black Awareness," *Daedalus*, Summer 1971, pp. 594-595.
[7] Gerald McWorter, "The Needs and Nature of the Black University," and Vincent Harding, "Some International Implications of the Black University," *Negro Digest*, March 1968.

The Governance of Universities

Nicholas Hobbs

The governance of universities has commanded much attention in the past few years. Several national commissions have addressed the topic. Many articles have been written about it. And many universities have had committees studying their own policies and procedures for getting things done to advance the academic enterprise.

No doubt much of the concern for how a university should govern itself grew out of the demands of students for representation on bodies making decisions affecting their lives, an expression of a world-wide interest in "participatory democracy." Student demands for a voice in governing the university were not inharmonious with the more or less democratic spirit that has prevailed on most college and university campuses in modern times, and not unreasonable for a generation of college students wise to the ways of the world and thoroughly capable of improving upon them.

But a demand for a wider sharing of responsibility for decision making would not in itself have created the crisis through which we have been passing. What stunned us all, raised anxieties within universities to high pitch, and prompted widespread public questioning of the ability of universities to govern themselves was the rejection by many students and by some faculty members of all order, of all established ways of getting problems solved. Due process was perceived, perhaps not without justification in some instances, as a put-off.

as a refuge from responsibility, as a luxury that could not be afforded, or as a convention appropriately displaced by the promptings of a higher and more authentic morality.

I

Within the not-so-cloistered walls of universities, innumerable committees on the governance of the university have met innumerable hours; they have engaged themselves with issues large and small; they have honed sentences to brittle perfection; and they have not come forth with much. From their reports, it appears that most committees on university governance seem to have shied away from theory and principle and to have become occupied, if not preoccupied, with procedural matters. Procedure is important, of course, but it tends to be particular to an institution, a codification of history and habit, sometimes but not often informed and elevated by explicit principle. There is just no good theory of university governance, except perhaps the theory of checks and balances,—derived from the American Constitution—that prescribes roles appropriate to boards of trustees, alumni, administrators, faculty members, and students. The social order that is the university awaits its Plato, Machiavelli, Locke, Jefferson, or Wilson.

I do not want to play down the importance of either role responsibilities or procedural regulations in the conduct of the affairs of a university. Both are absolutely essential, though far from sufficient, to keep a university open and operating in the service of its fundamental mission.

It is important for a board member to be attentive both to his heavy responsibility for a university and to the limits of his competence to shape the dimensions of its intellectual commitments.

It is important for the university administrator to appreciate that, up to a point, he does have substantial power to facilitate or impede almost any enterprise in a university. But let him know, too, that doubt of his own omniscience is his best friend and only savior, protecting him from arrogance and arming him with ex-

amined confidence to use his authority to productive purpose.

It is important for a faculty member to press for conditions favorable to teaching and learning, to inquiry and scholarship, to a flowering of the academic enterprise, with confidence that his own excellence as a teacher and scholar is a requisite, though not sufficient condition, for the maintenance of academic freedom.

It is important for a student, too, to keep clear his purpose in going to college. The student who participates in shaping university policy brings important perspectives too often neglected, and he is thus a major resource of renewal for a university. However, the student pays a high price for the opportunity to sit in academic councils. Every hour spent on a university committee is paid for in the most precious commodity provided by the college experience: time to read and think, time to talk and play with ideas, time to discover the dimensions of one's self and to dream of futures yet to be invented.

The familiar division of responsibilities among board members, administrators, faculty members, and students is much to be valued for making meaningful the concept of accountability. The board member who intrudes into administrative matters diminishes the possibility of holding administrators responsible for the conduct of the affairs of the university. The administrator who makes academic decisions affecting instruction or research without appropriate faculty involvement diminishes the possibility of holding the faculty accountable for the quality of the educational experience provided. The student who rejects established procedures for problem solving in seeking particular reforms weakens the responsibility of faculty, administrators, and trustees who remain responsible for the university long after the student has moved on. However, a preoccupation with established role responsibilities can generate nonproductive formalities in a university. People can become more concerned about the preservation of role and status than about the accomplishment of educational goals.

Emphasis on clarity of role and on accountability requires a sustained and imaginative investment in com-

munication. Satisfactory communication among the constituent groups of the university does not occur unless someone—usually the president or chancellor—appreciates its value and creates the conditions required for it to flourish. The effective president will budget time and money and his own best efforts to inform the constituents of the university about the problems and prospects of the university. To the extent that he can establish and sustain a high level of credibility, the more effective he is likely to be. A major objective is to prevent surprise; thus much of the president's communication is likely to be in anticipation of events ahead. Some universities seem to move from crisis to crisis; others manage equally complex problems with considerably less perturbation. The difference probably lies in part in the adequacy of the communication process.

In recent years we have learned how extraordinarily valuable it is to talk with students about many aspects of university affairs, and especially about those functions that bear directly on the student's well-being. With the keenness of vision that is the peculiar property of hindsight, it is astonishing that we were so obtuse as not to see in the student the competent and committed ally that he is in the making of a university. We need to remember that channels of communication were opened at the insistence of students whose methods ranged from violation of custom to violation of law. The danger now is that with the strange new quiet so evident on most campuses, we will forget the lesson learned with such travail in the past three or four years. To keep communications going, to keep alive the productive alliance of students, faculty, administrators, and trustees that was achieved in the most admirable of our institutions, the initiative may now have to come from faculty and administration. I fear a return of the student to a passive and uninvolved role with the consequent loss of community that is so vital to what we are trying to do. The university that lets this happen will surely be the poorer for it.

The various committees and commissions that have addressed themselves to the problem of university government and reported on their work fall short of their mark, it seems to me, because they tend to focus on

formal structures, on definition of roles, and on the delineation of procedures for accomplishing one thing or another. What is missing in their analyses is an appreciation of the dynamics of university government and management, of the politics of university life, if you will, and of the intricate interplay of forces that characterize any complex and purposeful social institution. It is a commonplace observation that organizational charts are always imperfect representations of the true lines of authority, responsibility, and influence. It is in the very discrepancy between formal structure and system function that lies the exciting and creative component of university governance.

II

The university is a very peculiar social organization. Businessmen particularly are baffled by its apparent inefficiencies, by the seemingly limited authority of the chief administrative officer, by the idiosyncratic purpose of individual members of the faculty, by the impertinence of students, and perhaps most of all by the university's resistence to change in itself while provoking change in society. Let us examine some of the seeming vagaries in the dynamics of the university as a social institution with the hope of gaining understanding of events that must often seem to be the product of sheer perversity.

That *colleague* and *college* have a common etymological root is significant. The college or university is very much an assemblage of colleagues, their fealty springing as much from association with others of like mind as from a commitment to a particular institution. The diffuse authority that characterizes the organization of most colleges and universities arises not from perversity or willingness on the part of the professor, nor from timidity or failure to exercise authority on the part of the administrator. In fact, the administrator often has to use his authority to preserve the integrity of the system against impatient students, board members, or even faculty members who want the administrator to impose requirements on a department or a school that may be considered inappropriate or invalid by the

peers of the department or school.

The university is engaged in the generation and communication of knowledge, an enterprise so complex, so wide-ranging, and so emergent in character that reliance has to be placed on the participants in the process for monitoring their own endeavors. As a university administrator, I would regard it fatuous for me to presume to judge the competence of a physicist, an anatomist, a theologian, an electrical engineer. As a psychologist, I could make some kind of contribution to the evaluation of a psychologist, but even then I would want the confirming judgment of other colleagues. But how can I judge the importance of investing university resources in an electron spin resonance spectrometer, in collecting manuscripts from Coptic monastaries in Ethiopia, in excavating the chthonian sanctuary at Morgantina, Sicily?

The principles of governance of colleges and universities are, of course, powerfully conservative in their influence. Thus the administrator, whose task by definition is to initiate and manage change, must on the one hand rely on and defend the system and, on the other hand, introduce all kinds of disturbances to minimize parochialism, complacency, and prejudice, and to encourage experimentation, daring, disciplinary modesty, and a heightened sensitivity to emergent requirements of the institution and of society.

III

The nature of university government would seem to be a counsel of confusion, a design for randomness and cross-purpose, an invitation for expression at variance with larger objectives. Two observations help make sense of what might appear to be administrative folly: First, the risk of confusion, poor judgment, or error is the price one pays for the release of the creative potential of a collection of very bright, well-trained, hard working, and responsible individuals. And, secondly, there are some forces that operate or can be made to operate in the interest of order, consensus, and shared purpose.

One order-producing influence is the inherent conser-

vatism of the collegial system. One is more likely to despair at its intransigence and immobility than at its volatility. Another order-producing tactic is systematic, administrative review. The administration cannot be careless or unconcerned about the consequences of choices made. Systematic review of decisions made at lower echelons can provide operational incidents for the discussion of criteria, goals, and purposes as well as of procedures.

A third and by far the most important of the convergent forces is communication. A flat administrative structure requires effective communication or it will not work. At every echelon of administration, within each purposeful group in the university, there must be much talk and much writing directed toward the generation of shared expectancies about the future. It is extremely important to get at least a measure of accord on major objectives, to define and share aspirations for what the department or school or college or university should become. Such definitions have powerful consequences in the shaping of the behavior of those who identify with them. Expectancies generated by definitions tend to be self-fulfilling.

A fourth source of order and of ease in problem solving is a strong sense of community among the many constituencies of a university. Here communication is important but not sufficient. Ceremonies and rituals, often taken lightly in our informal age, can be an important source of common identity, giving unity and personal meaning to the disparate enterprises that are essential to the operation of a university. Even a winning football team, yearned for by the alumni and scorned with less than complete conviction by the faculty, can contribute to the governing process.

Universities work best, are most creative, most productive, and most responsible, in my opinion, when organized with a relatively flat administrative structure. An effort should be made to keep responsibility for decisions as close to the point of action as possible. The objective is to give widest play to the range of talents of every individual in the organization. The instructor should feel maximum freedom and maximum

responsibility for what goes on in his classroom, the department chairman for what goes on in his department, the dean for what goes on in his school, and so on. To achieve maximum freedom and responsibility, the administrator must give maximum encouragement to others to invent what the university is to become.

This principle of governance should be extended to include students and when it is, it can become an important concept in the design of the curriculum. I believe that the concept most likely to influence educational reform in the years ahead is the notion that the student should have primary responsibility for planning educational experiences and for carrying out agreed upon obligations designed to yield greatest educational return from these experiences. What happens to a student in a college or university today is structured in advance of his coming on considerations marginally related to the individual's purposes and aspirations. It is no wonder lack of fit between institutional arrangements and individual aspirations so often causes the kind of disappointments with the college experience that Frank Newman describes in his essay. It is the nature of professions and of disciplines to hold their secrets, disclosing them to neophytes only after they have demonstrated their seriousness of purpose, their worthiness for inclusion in the brotherhood, by reading innumerable books and sitting through innumerable lectures preparatory to doing the real thing later on. Middle class students trained to delay gratification manage this reasonably well but at a considerable loss of zest for what they are doing. Other students not trained in this cardinal virtue simply chuck it all early.

Instead of going to college to participate in a set of prearranged experiences within a set time frame, the student could work out with his advisor a contract for a set of experiences designed to move the student toward goals he feels are consequential and worthy of his best efforts. The contract would stipulate performance expectations, and there would be agreement as to how the accomplishment of objectives is to be evaluated. The contract, which would be reviewed periodically in response to the changing needs of the student, might call for experiences on or off the campus and over a

variable time span. In fact, the contract could become the basis for a relationship between the individual and the university throughout his life span. It would become an instrument for the development of one's potential, not just a plan for getting a degree.

I hope it is clear that I am not proposing a return to the free elective system or cafeteria-style education. On the contrary, I am proposing a clearly defined course of work or pattern of experience that explicitly defines objectives, specifies obligations for achieving objectives, and requires an assessment of the extent to which the objectives have been achieved. The curriculum would be just as clearly structured as in the most traditional programs of study, but it would be designed not with a generalized student in mind but in accordance with the purposes of a particular student.

Nor am I suggesting that there be no requirements apart from the aspirations of an individual student. If a student elects to be a physician or a psychologist, this would commit him to the accomplishment of certain objectives defined by the professions involved. But even here, the pacing and ordering of experiences might be modulated to enhance particular purposes of an individual. I would encourage considerably more freedom in defining experiences required for a liberal education with the confidence that a purposeful student and a liberally educated faculty member working together can design a far more effective set of experiences than can be designed in advance by a curriculum committee and prescribed for all comers.

IV

Earlier I extolled the virtues of disciplines as providing the kind of informed judgment of competence and accomplishment that is essential for the operation of a university. I should like now to argue that, in the governance of the university, there must be a sustained and creative endeavor to overcome the oppressive force of disciplinary alignments. Although one can get ready assent to the notion that knowledge is probably unitary, it is clear that most faculty members operate on a cosmology derived from a college catalog. Knowledge

is packaged by established disciplines and served up in blocks of time called quarters or semesters, and these arrangements are all but immutable. Knowledge is also best acquired by verbal excitation 50 minutes long, three times a week, with mastery being defined as the ability to put symbols on a piece of paper with a selectivity and an ordering pleasing to the instructor.

Dael Wolfle in a recent issue of *Science* wonders, as many have done before him, if the whole concept of disciplines and departments is not so outmoded as to be a major impediment to the effective functioning of a university. Many efforts have been made to displace departments as defined by disciplines, and most of these efforts have failed. Traditional departments tend to re-emerge regardless of new groupings, new labels, and new organizational strategies. However, this does not mean that the effort to achieve a more rational ordering of the university should be abandoned; on the contrary, what is called for is more effort, more ingenuity, and more patience.

At my own institution, we have been giving serious thought to an arrangement that promises to preserve and enhance some of the virtues of departmental and disciplinary organization, while gaining the benefits of alignments of peoples in accordance with competences required to get solutions to some of our major national problems. What has been proposed is a grid plan for organizing the university. The concept was developed in business and industry and has most impressively demonstrated its effectiveness in the space program.

The traditional vertical organization of the university by schools and by departments in schools would be preserved. Across this vertical structure, which is defined by disciplines, would be laid five or six horizontal structures defined by problems. The horizontal groupings might be called "programs" or "centers" or "faculties" or something to differentiate them from departments, colleges, and schools. Programmatic content and direction would be determined by major problems that reflect, on the one hand, national needs for the application of knowledge, and, on the other hand, the university's competence to meet those needs. For example, there might be programs with titles such as the quality

of the environment, the delivery of health and social services, fertility and population, and individual rights and the common good. Brought together in a program would be members of the faculty from any department in the university, the only requirement being that the person have the competencies to contribute to the solution of problems in the area to which he is assigned. The director of a cross-cutting program would be a man of high competence with stature and authority equivalent to that of a dean. The arrangement violates one of the traditions of governance, namely that a person should have only one boss. Each person participating in a program would have two bosses, his department chairman or dean and his program director. The scheme got a man on the moon and it might possibly help universities to align themselves functionally with the problems of the society they seek to serve. I have no illusions that a grid plan for the organization of a university will overcome for all time the insularity of disciplines. However, it might help a bit.

V

Let me examine the issue of distributed power and responsibility in terms of the role of the chief executive officer of the college or university. In doing so, we should be mindful that different times and different circumstances require different answers. One design for the assignment of authority and responsibility will not be sufficient for all seasons.

Dispersed authority works best in more or less normal times, but can result in an immobilization of the university at times of crisis. Thus a number of recent reports on the governance of universities, spawned at a time of prolonged stress in the academic community, have called for "strengthening the presidency." This seems to me an insufficient prescription for our difficulties. It is hardly the way out to return to the tyrants of the first part of this century, whose confident wielding of power generated countless stories amusing only because they involved people and interests long passed. The task of the president is to know when to exercise the full power of his office and when to yield to others,

or in what areas he should assert his authority in full and in what areas he should assert himself more gently or not at all. A "strong president" will not be "strong" at all times and in all matters; the need of a president to feel himself strong, or to be perceived as being strong, can be a disastrous weakness. Even when he appears to succeed, and order prevails, the vitality of the institution is likely to be greatly diminished. The greatness of a university is created largely by the faculty in classrooms, laboratories, and libraries, and in public service, and not by the wielding of presidential power.

When trust prevails between the president and the faculty, when the faculty knows that the president is committed to the integrity of the academic program, to orderly process, and to the principle of distributed authority and responsibility, it is possible for the president to get ready assent to his assumption of extraordinary authority—for a time and for the solution of particular problems, such as a budgetary crisis. Discrimination in the use of presidential power is necessary to preserve and enhance the vitality of the institution.

What in fact are the sources of presidential power in a university? They are not abundant and they are not so much available by virtue of office as by personal skill in their use.

The president has control over budgets, and this of course is an important source of power. However, it is not nearly so great as a businessman, accustomed to manipulatable inventories and dispensable personnel, might think it would be. The major expense of a university is personnel and most personnel are not movable. A substantial amount of the income of a modern university goes directly from an agency to a department or a professor. The president has control of expenditures at the margin, of noncommitted monies that are often a small percentage of any annual budget.

The president has the power of appointment of administrative officers and of university committees. He has almost complete discretion in the appointment of provosts, vice-presidents, and other top administrators, but he is wise to seek consultation and a good measure of assent even to these. He appoints academic deans,

but his discretion is in fact considerably limited to a choice among a few options generated by faculty committees. He may (or may not) appoint department chairmen, but if he does, his authority is largely that of the veto. Discretion in the appointment of committees and the choice of problems on which committees will work is considerably less encumbered than his discretion in the appointment of administrators, and it is a major source of presidential influence on the course a university will take. The importance of this instrument of university governance as it relates to presidential influence is too little appreciated in commentaries on the subject.

The president has a larger access to audiences—to alumni, trustees, administration, faculty and students—than anyone else in the university by far. This is a very considerable source of power, and is frequently not sufficiently appreciated.

Finally, there is nothing quite so important in the exercise of presidential authority as a clear sense of purpose and a genuine appreciation of (and oftentimes patience with!) due process in the solution of problems. Tenacious pursuit of clear goals is important because opponents are likely to be divided, to have short memories, to get bored and turn to other causes, to move on, or otherwise to dissipate their effective opposition. Attention to procedure is important because of its intrinsic value and because proposals opposed on both substantive and procedural grounds are more likely to be defeated than proposals where substance alone is at question. Thus clarity of purpose and tenacity of its pursuit through established procedures are two complementary sources of presidential power in the governance of universities.

The Community College: Myth and Reality

Richard C. Richardson, Jr.

In the early years of this century, William Rainey Harper, then president of the University of Chicago, introduced a new concept. Rumor has it that Dr. Harper was seeking an idea to help private higher education accommodate itself to the developing influence of the recently established land-grant institutions, which were expanding rapidly at that time in an attempt to secure for themselves a position of status and respect within the higher education community. It is very probable that Dr. Harper anticipated the decline of football at Chicago, and felt that if he could promote the idea that everyone should attend the first two years of college at a small local institution, preferably without a football team, it would be possible to prevent the state universities from developing the powerful teams that were eventually to bring them to national prominence. Even in those days, you see, private institutions kept one hand on their purse when shaking hands with their public counterparts. Subsequently, a limited development of junior colleges began, characterized by subtle intellectual discussions as to whether the junior college was an upward version of the secondary schools, a downward extension of the university, or in fact, even existed.

I suppose the entire idea of junior colleges might have been lost to posterity by the end of World War II if it had not been for the pressures generated by returning veterans. The GI Bill brought so many students to impoverished colleges and universities that most began

to entertain delusions of grandeur, raising standards to the point at which in many instances students were much brighter than their instructors. Of course, not all students did well enough on their entrance tests to attend the more selective institutions, so the overflow was accommodated in junior colleges, which had somehow managed to survive the years of neglect after William Rainey Harper. In addition to accommodating students who could not be served by other institutions, junior colleges also served another significant function. Because most had open-door admissions policies, since they needed all the students they could get, junior colleges made even the least distinguished four-year institutions feel a sense of superiority. The principle worked somewhat along the lines of segregation.

It is an established fact that minorities that are constantly advised they are inferior become sensitized after a period of time and begin to seek an identity that will provide them with status. Frequently the first step is a change in terminology, and so the "junior college" became the "community college." Next, there are certain claims to uniqueness accompanied by a developing pride in characteristics that were previously a source of some embarrassment. If it is one's lot to serve the educationally handicapped, this can become a source of distinction if it is done well. An astute junior college educator observed quite early that the products of great liberal arts colleges seemed to be best suited for selling life insurance insofar as they were prepared for anything at all. With the range of careers that this left open to the graduates of other institutions, it became a simple matter to develop one and two-year career and technical programs to prepare graduates for many of these jobs. While liberal arts graduates felt superior to those who enrolled in such programs, the inevitable comparison of the earnings of the former with those of the latter helped to compensate for the problems of status.

The rest of the history is only too familiar. A declining birth rate, student violence and charges of irrelevance leveled primarily at four-year colleges and universities, combined with increasing costs and reduced public support, brought an abrupt end to what will one day un-

doubtedly be fondly remembered as the golden age of expansionism in higher education. To make matters worse, those who tend the public coffers in Washington suddenly conceived a major interest in the educationally handicapped, in the minority student and in vocational education. The very responsibilities that in happier days conveyed a sense of superiority to those who did not have to engage in them now became a matter of central concern for the nation. The change of emphasis in funding patterns has resulted in financial advantage to those institutions which, of necessity, made a virtue of the willingness to undertake the more humble tasks of higher education.

Unquestionably we are dealing with an idea of great social significance that has captured the minds and the imaginations of people across the nation. By some stroke of fate never envisioned by the genius of Harper, the community college has achieved a position of preeminence in the last half of the twentieth century. The tasks commonly regarded as unrewarding have suddenly become the critical tasks that may determine the future direction of our society. In the age of mass media, there is a constant danger of reverting to the least common denominator of civilization, so the level of that denominator must be raised or civilization will regress. It is apparent that traditional higher education with its emphasis upon education of an elite is in no position to accomplish this task. What are the dimensions of this challenge and what contributions can be expected from the community college concept?

I

The community college concept involves, first of all, the question of who should have access to higher education. It is well known that family income is more closely correlated with attendance at an institution of higher education than is ability. A recent study indicated that in California, seven out of 10 students who graduate from secondary schools come from families with a total income of under $10,000. This is the same income group that pays 55 percent of the state's taxes. Fewer than 10 percent of the high school graduates falling in this

income bracket, however, enroll in state universities or colleges, while nearly 35 percent of those from families earning over $10,000 do enroll. A similar study completed by a doctoral student at the University of Florida indicated that families in the lower income brackets contribute more to the support of public higher education than they derive in benefits, while the situation is precisely reversed in higher income families. In other words, contrary to conventional wisdom, it would appear that lower income segments of our population are contributing more toward the support of higher education than they are deriving in direct benefits, while those who come from upper income levels are deriving more in benefits than they are contributing.

Education has long been viewed in our society as the path to upward mobility. To systematically deny access to higher education to broad segments of the population, as we have done in the past and are continuing to do to a considerable extent, seems inconsistent with national philosophy. Most institutions of higher education, other than community colleges, do practice some form of selective admissions. In a sense, they are dedicated to excluding students who might fail. It is only appropriate, therefore, to have one type of institution—the community college—concerned with those students who might succeed.

There are three characteristics of the community college concept that have, in the words of the Newman Report, made such institutions "the leading edge of the effort to extend opportunity for higher education beyond the elite to all citizens." The commitment to open admissions has led community colleges to adopt the practice of admitting all high school graduates as well as members of the general population who are over the age of 18 and give evidence of being able to benefit from instruction. There are some very compelling arguments in favor of this practice. We know, for example, that nontraditional students have performed poorly on the measures that are customarily used to determine admissibility. We also know that the science of prediction with respect to human behavior is a very inexact art. The only way that we can exclude substantial numbers of students who might fail is to exclude also substantial

numbers of students who might succeed. Therefore, it seems reasonable to admit such students, to provide them with extensive guidance in the structuring of their educational experience, and to use their performance to determine their educability rather than prejudging them on the basis of highly questionable criteria.

Combined with the practice of open admissions is low cost and accessibility. In many states, students are charged no tuition, while seldom does the cost of attendance equal more than one third of the cost of educating the student. Because community colleges are located close to the students they serve, many who are unable or unwilling to leave a specific locale can still have the opportunity of attending college.

Community colleges will not, in the words of a recent Carnegie-sponsored publication, "break the access barriers" to higher education without some serious difficulties. Financial support for community colleges, as for all forms of higher education, is a source of growing concern. One reason that the cost of attending such institutions has been kept low is that many community colleges rely upon local property taxes for a portion of their support. Increases in property taxes are being resisted and this is being felt by many community colleges. There is also a growing belief that higher education is a benefit to the individual and consequently should be financed by the individual. Those who support this position fail to understand the benefits to a society of increasing the number of its citizens who are educated to function in some form of constructive endeavor. It has always been less expensive to educate people than it has been to support them in idleness. If, however, we permit ourselves to be misled by statistics that purport to translate years of college into additional income, we may conclude that higher education is a privilege for which the individual should pay, either in advance or at some subsequent point in his life. If we attempt to shift a greater share of the burden of supporting higher education to the individual, we will inevitably reduce the number of non-traditional students who will attend. Such groups have consistently demonstrated their unwillingness to borrow or to engage in the forms of deficit

financing that are taken for granted by the more affluent segments of society.

There is also a growing anti-college feeling on the part of a large segment of the population. This feeling is manifest both in the attempt to shift a greater part of the financial burden to the individual and in a general depreciation of the value of college education. Increasingly, we find statements extolling the construction trades and comparing the salaries received by those in this area of endeavor with that paid to teachers. The implication is that education has returned to the days when those who could, did, and those who couldn't, taught. I do not believe that anyone has ever suggested that everyone should go to college. There are many, however, who have said that all who wish to attend and likely would profit from the programs available should have the opportunity. Hopefully, the current wave of anti-college sentiment may be followed by a renewed commitment to the concept of open access.

II

If community colleges do nothing more than enable more people to go to college, they will be guilty of the same kind of bias that is reflected in a book by Jencks and Riesman entitled *The Academic Revolution.* Those wishing to find out what academic snobbery is really all about should read this book.

Let me quote a statement which appears in a brief and terribly biased description of the community college: "These (community colleges) recruit many of their faculty from the public schools and many others from former teachers colleges, hire relatively few Ph.D.s from major graduate schools, show comparatively little deference to professional academic opinion about how an institution of higher learning should be run, and consequently teach both subjects and students who most scholars regard as worthless."

In my judgment, if this statement is a fair representation of the attitudes of most scholars and most colleges and universities, then this may well be the most damning indictment of American higher education that could possibly be made, for it is not in the tradition of this

nation to regard any of its citizens as worthless.

Jencks and Riesman give further evidence of their failure to understand the function of community colleges by suggesting that such institutions have failed because students in states with well-developed systems of community colleges do not attain the baccalaureate degree in appreciably higher numbers than students in states where there are no community colleges. If the community college is to serve any purpose at all, it must bring about a fundamental redefinition of the nature of higher education and of the nature of success. In the past we have defined success as the attainment of the baccalaureate degree. This assumption is no longer tenable for many reasons, not the least of which is the fact that the kinds of students who are seeking admission to institutions of higher education today are not suited for the artificial abstractions that are so central to the concept of the baccalaureate degree. There is also the serious question concerning the need for additional citizens who know a little about many things but very little about anything in particular. If the community college is to serve the non-traditional student, it must be through the development of programs that emphasize competencies that can be learned by non-traditional students and that promote constructive interaction between them and the rest of society. Under such circumstances, the traditional transfer program providing the first two years of the baccalaureate sequence becomes the lowest priority of all of the things that the community college does. Almost any institution can offer the first two years of a standard baccalaureate sequence with no thought or creative energy being put to the task at all. Four-year colleges and universities have been proving this for years. There are few good arguments for putting high priority on transfer programs in the comprehensive community college.

In place of the transfer program, I would suggest an alternative major priority of the community college: the development of one- and two-year, career-oriented programs teaching specific competencies leading to entry-level employment in a wide variety of positions. Based upon the manpower requirements of the economy,

such programs afford individuals an opportunity to learn the skills needed to function effectively in society. While such programs include a core of general education courses, the primary emphasis is upon job-oriented training. The career programs must not, however, be considered terminal. If we have learned anything during the past 20 years, we should have learned that there is no such thing as a terminal program, unless the commencement ceremony takes place in a mortuary.

In addition to career programs, which afford individuals an opportunity for entry-level employment while at the same time serving as a spring-board to additional preparation, consideration must be given to the need for teaching basic skills. There are many adults who for a variety of reasons have been unable to cope successfully with the public education system. In 1970, I chaired a survey team from the American Association of Junior Colleges which visited education programs for servicemen in Vietnam. I was astonished to learn that between 40 and 50 percent of the enlisted men in the Army were not high school graduates. Further, almost nothing was being done to help these men gain the kinds of skills that would make it possible for them to readjust to civilian life. Even if the public school systems solved the problems of the drop-out and of the non-achieving student tomorrow, there would still be an enormous backlog of functionally illiterate individuals. If the community college is to provide a realistic opportunity for those that it invites within its doors, it must develop a successful program to provide these individuals with the basic skills to complete successfully programs that provide job-related competencies. Community colleges must never follow the path chosen by some secondary schools, becoming custodial institutions where the body is imprisoned for a period of time and the mind unaffected.

We must also come to recognize education as a lifelong process for all citizens, not simply those who can afford to come to elite universities, or college professors who can afford to attend federally sponsored institutes, or physicians who can go to San Francisco for the American Medical Association meeting. If all citizens are to adjust to the complexities of rapid technological change, they must be provided with periodic opportunities to

retrain, to upgrade themselves, to learn new skills, to feel that life has not passed them by forever simply because they were unable to obtain advanced training after high school or because they never completed high school in the first place. The continuing education program of the community college must reach into all levels of all segments of the community wherever there is a job that must be done to make people more productive, to help them live more useful lives as participating citizens, or to help reshape the community in a more effective mold.

While I suggested that the college parallel program was a low priority, it is nonetheless a significant aspect of the comprehensive curriculum of the community college. If the connotation that a community college is simply another form of the county welfare home to be avoided, legitimate entry to all professions and occupations must be provided—and not just those that can be achieved through one or two years of career-oriented education. We know already that community colleges serve larger numbers of non-traditional students than do their four-year college and university counterparts. If blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans and poor whites are to have opportunities based upon ability rather than income, the community college must serve a multiplicity of purposes and must serve these purposes well.

It is only fair to note that barriers exist to the effective redefinition of success in higher education. First, we must consider the traditional attitudes concerning what is important. For too long, we have believed that a failure to attain the baccalaureate degree is equivalent to a diagnosis of terminal illness. It will take a while to change attitudes so that career programs, remedial education, and continuing education will be accepted as significant functions for an institution of higher education.

There is another problem in creating a new definition of success in higher education. Community colleges are frequently sold on the basis of the low cost at which they function. Many legislators and taxpayers have been led to believe that the community college is the next thing to getting something for nothing. While it is true that an individual who lives at home may complete his educa-

tion less expensively than one who lives away, his education will not cost less than work at four-year colleges and universities if the new goals outlined above for community colleges are adopted. Correcting deficiencies involving literacy is among the most difficult tasks that an institution can undertake. Offering relevant career education carefully structured to meet the demands of the economy and the conditions of human life is not inexpensive. At some point, the realistic costs of education in the community college must be faced. Hopefully when we do this we will also be prepared to examine the costs of not educating people in a highly technological society.

III

In addition to providing open access to the college classroom and redefining the nature of college education, the community college is also involved in the improvement of college teaching. Despite negative conclusions of some commissions that have studied higher education, a quiet revolution is taking place on many two-year college campuses. Student criticism of the lack of relevancy of much that is done by four-year colleges and universities has freed community college faculties from feeling that they must emulate their four-year counterparts. The shortcomings of the university model of instruction have been thoroughly identified during the past two years, and I need not go into them here. Suffice it to say, that the leadership in the area of instruction is in the process of shifting from the four-year institution to the community college, which has always had effective teaching as its principle objective.

Increasingly community colleges are using a systems approach to learning which attempts to use behavioral objectives to define more precisely what the teaching process is expected to accomplish and whether or not such objectives are attained. The subjective evaluations of the instructor are giving way to an analysis of student performance and the evaluation of student attitudes. Obviously, one major aspect of this approach is the assumption that the instructor is accountable for student learning. Less concern is being given to what the faculty know at the beginning of a course, as reflect-

ed by their degrees and credentials, and more attention to what the students know at the end of the course and how this relates to the objectives of the institution and the program.

Considerable publicity has been given in recent months to the surplus of Ph.D.s. Many individuals seem to feel that this represents a blessing to the community colleges, since it will now be possible for such institutions to increase the numbers of Ph.D. holders on their staffs. In my considered judgment, there is no worse disaster that could possibly befall the community college than to employ second- and third-rate Ph.D.s who have been cranked out by our large graduate schools in such numbers that they can no longer find employment in the perpetuation of their own profession. The Ph.D. is a research degree. While it is entirely possible that some who earn this degree are also capable of teaching, the experience of most community colleges that have employed Ph.D.s has been so universally poor as to create a positive prejudice against holders of this degree as faculty members in an institution that is concerned with teaching.

In recognition of this bias, there is now a major emphasis on the development of a new degree program called the Doctor of Arts. The Doctor of Arts program has many of the advantages of the Ph.D. from the point of view of the university in that it keeps roughly the same number of professors employed teaching graduate students for the same period of time. By the same token, both the candidates and those involved in teaching, hope that the emphasis away from research may convince two-year colleges that such individuals know something about teaching the kinds of students that we have. At the present time, I would have to advise college and university committees that the Doctor of Arts program is being observed with some skepticism. It is difficult to see how individuals committed to research rather than teaching, who know very little themselves about teaching, can prepare individuals to do that which they either are not capable of doing themselves—or, putting the best face upon it, give little evidence of being able to do effectively.

There will be a problem, then, in extending and con-

tinuing current efforts to improve the quality of instruction and the effectiveness of instruction because of the difficulty of finding faculty with the right qualifications. Many community colleges have just about reached the point at which they feel that if non-traditional students are to be served effectively, they are going to have to prepare their own faculty, at least insofar as matters of pedagogy are concerned. It should be very apparent that one does not need a Ph.D. nor a Doctor of Arts degree to teach remedial writing. It is also questionable whether one needs a Ph.D. with an emphasis on Shakespeare in order to teach composition effectively.

I have mentioned the systems approach to learning and the use of behavioral objectives. Education is very addicted to fads. Right now, the systems approach is the magic word. In becoming involved in new practices, care should be taken to avoid going to the extremes that have taken place in some institutions where the attempt to force innovation has defeated the very objectives for which the institution existed. Innovations or approaches to learning must not become more important than the students who experience them.

IV

Another priority of the community college relates to the revision of the governance process. While community colleges are learning under somewhat less violent circumstances the lessons of unfortunate regulations and irrelevant educational practices previously experienced by four-year institutions, the advent of collective bargaining and the growth of the union movement threatens to create within community colleges a struggle for power between administrators and boards of trustees on the one hand, and faculty organizations on the other. Most of us would endorse more involvement in the governance process on the part of faculty. But if this is to be achieved through a long and arduous power struggle, who will be looking after interests of students during this period? The answer, of course, is no one.

We know now that relationships between people determine the productivity of the environment. Many two-year colleges are experimenting with an attempt to

replace authority as a basis for institutional relationships with interdependency. Some are attempting to replace the large bureaucratic pyramid, which seems to govern so much of our lives in an impersonal way, with an arrangement that emphasizes partnership among students, faculty, and administration, marked by a commitment on the part of all three groups to work out their differences of opinion through compromises rather than by making unilateral decisions or non-negotiable demands. The process is not an easy one to implement, and it requires much learning on the part of all concerned. I would be less than candid if I suggested that productive human relationships will be achieved any more easily in community colleges than in four-year colleges and universities.

I can state with a considerable degree of assurance that community colleges are at least as far along in promoting this reappraisal of human relationships as are our four-year counterparts. We are aware of the need to redefine the roles of faculty, students and administration in order to make these roles more consistent with the needs of those who fill them, and with the kind of conditions that our institutions must inevitably experience as a consequence of social change.

There will be problems in implementing this priority just as there are problems in implementing the other priorities I have identified. The trustees of many two-year colleges like the trustees of four-year colleges and universities are very unrepresentative of those they are supposed to represent. Coming from the older, better established, more affluent majority segments of the population, they are frequently ill-equipped to understand the needs of non-traditional students. The problems involved in re-educating trustees will be massive indeed in order to permit movement to a truly participational form of governance. There is also a substantial credibility gap between students, faculty and administration, brought about by the conflict that has taken place during the past few years. Faculty members for the most part have had to force their rights from extremely reluctant administrators who have not infrequently appealed to external constituencies such as the legislature to maintain their power over faculty members.

The resultant breakdown of communication will have to be repaired if the level of human relationships necessary to sustain a productive relationship is to prevail. To say that community colleges are no worse off than four-year colleges and universities is not at this particular point much of a recommendation.

V

The community college is a community institution. In this respect it turns its back on the ivory tower tradition and upon the town-and-gown conflicts. In a very real sense the college is the community, both in terms of those who are served and those who determine its direction. Local advisory committees exist to determine the priority of needs. The advice of such committees is given at least as much attention as the professional expertise of the faculty. The assumption is that while faculty may be subject-matter specialists, they are not specialists in the community. If the college is to serve the community, there is as much need for this expertise as there is for academic expertise.

A major barrier to closer college community relationships is the tendency for state governments and for state universities to assume responsibilities for the sponsorship and administration of two-year colleges. I have visited institutions that do not have local boards of control and where there is limited local support. Such institutions almost inevitably fail to become vital parts of the community they serve. They are simply another institution established and maintained by the largesse of the state or the federal government, but they are apart from the vital aspects of community life. If we are to have a strong community orientation for the comprehensive community college, we must have at the very least strong local advisory committees with real power, combined with some form of local support. If we permit ourselves to move in the easy direction of burying community colleges at the bottom of a large pyramid, we can scarcely expect that such institutions will have a vital relationship with their respective communities.

In conclusion, let me say that truly there is no such institution as a community college. There is, instead, an idea whose time has come: that there must be equality of educational opportunity if the promise of our nation is to be the same for all. There are many institutions seeking to implement this concept with varying degrees of skill and different results, but they are bound together by a common faith and a common pride. The task that must be done is large, and there are many reasons for despair. At the same time there is recognition that the task must be done if the citizens of this nation are to have the kind of educational opportunities they require to participate productively in a free society. Community colleges can, and will, provide these opportunities.

Bibliography

Blocker, C.E., R.H. Plummer and R.C. Richardson, Jr., *The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis,* Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965.

Cross, K. Patricia, *The Junior College Student: A Research Description,* Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J., 1968.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *A Chance to Learn: An Action Agenda for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education,* Special Report, McGraw Hill Book Co., New York, March, 1970.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *The Open Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges,* Special Report, McGraw Hill Book Co., New York, June, 1970.

Gleazer, E.J. Jr., *This is the Community College,* Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1968.

Harlacher, E.L., *The Community Dimension of the Community College,* Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969.

Knoell, D.M. and L.L. Medsker, *From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of The Transfer Student,* American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1965.

Medsker, L.L. and D. Tillery, *Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two Year Colleges,* McGraw Hill Book Co., New York, 1971.

Richardson, R.C. Jr., "Restructuring the Human Dimensions of our Colleges," *Junior College Journal,* Vol. 41, February, 1971. pp. 20-25.

Roueche, John E., *Salvage, Redirection or Custody: Remedial Education in the Community-Junior College,* American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1968.

Biographical Information

John Kenneth Folger

Mr. Folger received his A.B. degree from Emory University in 1943, his M.S. degree in 1950 and his Ph.D. in 1951 from the University of North Carolina. He was chief of technical services at the Human Resources Research Institute, USAF, Montgomery, Alabama in 1951-53. He was research associate of the Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta in 1953-57, and associate director in 1957-61. He was dean of the Graduate School, Florida State University, Tallahassee in 1961-65 and 1967-68. He was director of the Commission on Human Resources, National Academy of Sciences, 1965-67; and a member of the technical advisory committee of the 1960 and 1970 United States census. Mr. Folger has been the director of the Tennessee Commission on Higher Education since 1968.

John P. Gaventa

Mr. Gaventa was enrolled at Vanderbilt as an honorary founder's scholar. At the university, he served as president of the Student Association, founder and chairman of the Educational Affairs Council, representative to the Board of Presidents, and as a member of the Chancellor's Commission on University Governance. He served as student assistant to President Nixon's Commission on Campus Unrest and also worked with the President's Scranton Commission. He was graduated magna cum laude from Vanderbilt in 1971 and the same year, was elected to the University's Board of Trust. Following graduation, Mr. Gaventa planned to study philosophy,

politics and economics at Balliol College in Oxford, England, as a Rhodes scholar.

Alexander Heard

The degrees earned by Mr. Heard include the following: B.A. and LL.D. from the University of North Carolina, 1938 and 1968; M.A., Ph.D. and LL.D. from Columbia University, 1948, 1951 and 1965; L.H.D., Pepperdine College, 1968; and D.Sc. from the University of Chattanooga, 1969. Mr. Heard began his career in 1939 in the United States government service. In 1946-49 he worked as a research associate in the Bureau of Public Administration at the University of Alabama. During the years 1950-63, he worked at the University of North Carolina where he assumed the posts of associate professor, professor of political science, and dean of the Graduate School. In 1957-58 he was Ford research professor of government at Harvard University. He has been chancellor of Vanderbilt University since 1963. Mr. Heard is an authority on southern politics and on the financing of political campaigns. In 1961-62 he served as chairman of President Kennedy's bipartisan Commission on Campaign Costs. He was president of the Southern Political Association in 1961-62, and vice-president of the American Political Science Association in 1962-63. In 1964 President Johnson appointed him to serve on the National Citizens' Committee for Community Relations and in 1967 to serve on the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. President Nixon in 1969 appointed him to serve on the Commission on White House Fellows, to serve on the Task Force on Priorities in Higher Education, and in May of 1970 to serve as special advisor to the President on campus affairs. He is president of the Citizens' Research Foundation, a member of the Board of Trustees of the Ford Foundation and of the Board of Directors of Time, Inc.

Nicholas Hobbs

Mr. Hobbs received his A.B. degree from The Citadel in 1936. He received M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Ohio State University in 1938 and 1946 respectively. He began his professional career in 1936 as a secondary school teacher. In 1946 he worked in the Army Air Force

Psychological Research Program. He was head of the Clinical Psychology Program at Teachers College, Columbia University from 1946 to 1950. In 1950, he assumed the position of head of the Department of Psychology at Louisiana State University. From 1951 through 1965 he was chairman of the Division of Human Development at George Peabody College for Teachers. During this period he was a visiting professor of psychology at Harvard University, lecturer at the Institute of Humanistic Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, and director of selection and research for the Peace Corps. He was a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in Palo Alto, California, in 1966. In 1967 he became provost of Vanderbilt University and director of the John F. Kennedy Center for Research on Education and Human Development at George Peabody College for Teachers. Mr. Hobbs resigned his position as director of the Kennedy Center in 1970 to devote full time to Vanderbilt. He has been president of the American Psychological Association (1966); president, Division of Clinical Psychology (1961); and president of the American Psychological Foundation (1970).

Frank Newman

Mr. Newman has received the following degrees: B.A. from Brown University in 1946; B.S. in Engineering from Brown University in 1949; and M.S. in Business Administration from Columbia University in 1955. He has done additional graduate work at Oxford University and Stanford University. He began his career in 1949 as market sales manager with Honeywell Corporation in New York. In 1955 he held the post of division manager for Beckman Instrument Company in Berkeley, California. He was an unsuccessful Republican candidate for Congress in 1966. Since 1967 he has been associate general secretary of Stanford University and is currently the associate director of university relations there. Mr. Newman is chairman of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities. In 1969, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Robert H. Finch appointed Mr. Newman to head a task force to make recommendations for reform of higher education.

Richard C. Richardson, Jr.

Mr. Richardson received his undergraduate education at Castleton State College in Vermont. He holds the M.A. from Michigan State University and the Ph.D. from the University of Texas. He has taught at Vermont College in Montpelier, Vt., and was dean of student personnel services at Meramec Community College in St. Louis, Mo. In 1964-1967, he was dean of instruction at Forest Park Community College in St. Louis. In 1967, he became president of Northampton County Area Community College in Bethlehem, Pa. He serves as university lecturer in higher education at Lehigh University in Bethlehem. Mr. Richardson is the author of "Interim Campus—Starting New Community Junior Colleges" and the co-author of "Governance for the Two Year College," "The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis," and "Student's Guide to the Two Year College." He has served with numerous professional associations and state councils concerned with higher education.

Stephen Wright

Mr. Wright's degrees include the following: B.S., Hampton Institute, 1934; M.A., Howard University, 1939; Ph.D., New York University, 1943; LL.D., Colby College, 1962, University of Notre Dame, 1964, Morgan State College, 1965, New York University, 1966, and Michigan State University, 1966. He began his professional career as a high school principal in Upper Marlboro, Maryland, in 1936. In 1939 he became director of student teaching at North Carolina College, and in 1943-44 he assumed the post of chairman of the Department of Education and dean of men. He moved to Hampton Institute in 1944 where he was professor of education and director of divinity education. In 1945 he became dean of the faculty at Hampton Institute. He accepted the presidency of Bluefield State College in West Virginia in 1953. During 1957-66 he was president of Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee. He was president of the United Negro College Fund in New York City in 1966. Mr. Wright presently is vice-president of the College Entrance Examination Board.

SNPA Foundation Seminar Books

Compacts of Antiquity: State Constitutions
Violence and Dissent in Urban America
What is Happening to American Women
Inflation: 1970 Style
School Desegregation: Retrospect and Prospect
The Future of Aging and the Aged
The Insurance Crisis
The Prospects for Higher Education

Price: Two dollars each

Southern Newspaper Publishers Association Foundation
P.O. Box 11606, Atlanta, Georgia 30305